VOL. XLIV No. 3

The Catholic Historical Review

ALFRED C. RUSH, C.SS.R. MARTIN R. P. McGUIRE
JOHN TRACY ELLIS
Managing Editor

ADVISORY EDITORS

HENRY G. J. BECK
Immaculate Conception Seminary, Darlington

EDWARD D. McSHANE, S.J.
Alma College

GEORGE L. A. REILLY
Seton Hall University

BASIL LEO LEE, F.S.C.
Manhattan College

FREDERICK B. PIKE
University of Notre Dame

WALTER W. WILKINSON
Georgetown University

Table of Contents

OCTOBER, 1958

ARTICLES

Parliament and Catholicism in England 1626-1629 *Martin J. Havran* 273

Bishop Elder and the Civil War . . *Willard E. Wight* 290

MISCELLANY

A Letter of Bishop Flaget to Henry Clay *Thomas Whitaker* 307

BOOK REVIEWS 313

NOTES AND COMMENTS 386

BRIEF NOTICES 392

PERIODICAL LITERATURE 397

BOOKS RECEIVED 403

BOOK REVIEWS

Histoire Universelle des Missions Catholiques. Volume I. *Les Missions des Orgines au XVI^e Siècle;* Volume II, *Les Missiones Modernes (XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles).* (Edited by Simon Delacroix). William J. Coleman 313

The Canons of the Council of Sardica, A.D. 343. (Hamilton Hess). Frederick R. McManus 316

Saint Bernard of Clairvaux. (Bruno S. James). Richard A. Trame 317

St. Dominic. Pilgrim of Light. (Gerard K. Brady). William A. Hinnebusch 318

Geschichte des Konzils von Trient. Band II; *Die erste Trienter Tagungsperiode, 1545-47.* (Hubert Jedin). Henry G. J. Beck 319

The Influence of Erasmus, Witzel, and Cassander in the Church Ordinances and Reform Proposals of the United Duchies of Cleve during the Middle Decades of the 16th Century. (John Patrick Dolan, C.S.C.). Raphael M. Huber 321

The Spiritans: A History of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost. (Henry J. Koren, C.S.SP.). Raphael M. Wiltgen 418

The Catholic Church in the Modern World. (E. E. Y. Hales). Thomas P. Neill 323

Origines et Formation du Catholicisme Social en Belgique, 1842-1909. (Rudolf Rezsohazy). Joseph N. Moody 324

Archives of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe, 1678-1900. (Angelico Chavez, O.F.M.). Stephen Donlon 326

What Happened to Religious Education? The Decline of Religious Teaching in the Public Elementary School, 1776-1861. (William Kailer Dunn). John Whitney Evans 327

American Protestanism and Social Issues, 1919-1939. (Robert Moats Miller). Francis X. Curran 329

On the Philosophy of History. (Jacques Maritain). Robert Paul Mohan 330

The Nature of Biography. (John A. Garraty). Annabelle M. Melville 331

The Art of Architecture. (Sir Albert Richardson and Hector O. Corfiato). Thomas H. Locraft 333

Troy: Settlements VIIa, VIIb, and VIII. (Carl W. Blegen, Cedric G. Boulter, John L. Caskey, Marion Rawson). Martin R. P. McGuire 335

Social and Political Thought in Byzantium. From Justinian I to the Last Palaeologus. Passages from Byzantine Writers and Documents translated with an Introduction and Notes. (Ernest Barker). Cyril Toumanoff 336

Six Historians. (Ferdinand Schevill). Friedrich Engel-Janosi 343

The Frontier in Perspective. (Edited by Walker D. Wyman and Clifton B. Kroeber). Thomas P. Coffey 344

A History of the English Speaking Peoples. Volume III. *The Age of Revolution.* (Winston S. Churchill). James E. Bunce 346

A Short History of India. (W. H. Moreland and Atul Chandra Chatterjee). *The Transfer of Power in India.* (V. P. Menon). *Party Politics in India.* (Myron Weiner). Lewis B. Clingman 347

Matthew Paris. (Richard Vaughan). James A. Corbett 349

The Life of Edward the Second. (By the So-called Monk of Malmesbury, Translated and edited by N. Denholm-Young). Owen J. Blum 350

Traité d'Emmanuel Piloti sur le passage en Terre Sainte (1420). (Edited by Pierre-Herman Dopp). David Herlihy 352

Portugal and the Portuguese World. (Richard Pattee). George C. A. Boehrer 354
Doctor Rabelais. (D. B. Wyndham Lewis). Richard M. Douglas 355
The Day They Killed the King. (Hugh Ross Williamson). Marvin R. O'Connell 356
The New Cambridge Modern History. Volume VII. *The Old Regime 1713-63.* (Edited by J. O. Lindsay). Crane Brinton 357
English Historical Documents. Volume X. *1714-1783.* (Edited by David Bayne Horn and Mary Ransome). James E. Bunce 358
Burke and the Nature of Politics: The Age of American Revolution. (Carl B. Cone). Thomas H. D. Mahoney 360
Allied Wartime Diplomacy: A Pattern in Poland. (Eduard J. Rozek). Roman Smal-Stocki 361
Soviet Diplomacy and the Spanish Civil War. (David T. Cattell). Carlton J. H. Hayes 363
The American Idea of Mission. Concepts of National Purpose and Destiny. (Edward McNall Burns). Anthony F. Turhollow 364
American Judaism. (Nathan Glazer). John M. Oesterreicher 365
Master Roger Williams. A Biography. (Ola Elizabeth Winslow). Robert C. Newbold 367
The South in the Revolution, 1763-1789. (John Richard Alden). Richard Walsh 368
George Washington. A Biography. (Douglas Southall Freeman). Volume VI, *Patriot and President.* With a foreword by Dumas Malone. Volume VII, *First in Peace.* (John Alexander Carroll and Mary Wells Ashworth). John J. Meng 370
The Hudson's Bay Company as an Imperial Factor, 1821-1869. (John S. Galbraith). William L. Davis 372
The Role of the Supreme Court in American Government and Politics, 1835-1864. (Charles Grove Haines and Foster H. Sherwood). Sister Marie Carolyn Klinkhamer 373
The Prohibition Movement in California, 1848-1933. (Gilman M. Ostrander). Sister Joan Marie Donohoe 375
Created Equal: The Complete Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858. (Edited and Introduction by Paul M. Angle). Thomas B. Dunn 377
Tin Can on a Shingle. (William Chapman White and Ruth White).
How the Merrimac Won. (R. W. Daly).
The Rebel Shore: The Story of Union Sea Power in the Civil War. (James M. Merrill). Harold D. Langley 378
Theodore Roosevelt. The Formative Years, 1858-1886. A Biography. Volume I. (Carleton Putnam). John T. Farrell 379
American Industry and the European Immigrant, 1860-1885. (Charlotte Erickson). Sister Joan Bland 381
America and the Fight for Irish Freedom, 1866-1922. (Charles Callan Tansill). Maurice R. O'Connell 382
Portrait of an American Labor Leader: William L. Hutcheson. Saga of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, 1881-1954. (Maxwell C. Raddock). J. Joseph Huthmacher 384

The Catholic Historical Review

Vol. XLIV OCTOBER, 1958 No. 3

PARLIAMENT AND CATHOLICISM IN ENGLAND 1626 - 1629

By

Martin J. Havran*

Religion so permeated life in England during the early seventeenth century that scarcely any channel of human endeavor escaped its influence.[1] Few men questioned the existence of God and ethical values which governed behavior, but they no longer agreed to common religious doctrines or practices. The religious settlement of 1559 required conformity to the Established Church, and the penal laws after 1570 made traitors of Roman Catholics as well as Separatists. But the Puritans who accepted the Anglican sacrament and worked to cleanse the Church of England of "romish" practices grew so strong by the early seventeenth century that they began successfully to employ Parliament as an arena where the battle with the crown over the rubric was fought. In pursuing its aims the House of Commons, now increasingly composed of Puritans, learned that it might use Catholic persecution to forestall the crown's requests for subsidies, and thereby to win the right to initiate reform in the Established Church along Puritan lines at the expense of royal prerogative.

Moreover, the members who occupied the back benches in the Commons from 1625 to 1629 sat resolutely against divine right monarchy. Their predecessors during the reign of Elizabeth I had not lacked initiative in this regard, but the crown had managed to

* Mr. Havran is an instructor in history in Kent State University.

[1] I am grateful to the Social Science Research Council for a research fellowship for 1956-1957 which enabled me to read materials in England.

control their democratizing tendencies in religion through the direction of privy councillors who not only led the debates in the lower house but also chaired every important committee. Elizabeth thereby avoided sharp conflict over unfavorable legislation by killing it in committee.[2] Furthermore, the continuance of war with Spain, and the fear of Catholic plots, temporarily welded the interests of crown and Commons. But the early Stuarts, particularly Charles I, tried unwisely to hug all authority to themselves and to their favorites rather than to share it with the Commons.

Even though Parliament in 1625 had bitterly attacked the Roman Church,[3] Catholics believed that they would benefit by the rift which was developing between the Commons and the king. It was plain that the reluctance of the lower house to grant customary subsidies was the result of its growing determination to resist the royal will. Catholics hoped that Charles' pride would overcome his wisdom, and that when the Commons ignored his request for funds he would dissolve it. In this event their position would improve, they believed, since experience had proved personal government to be more lenient toward Catholicism than parliamentary government.[4] Since Charles hated Puritanism, Catholics hoped that a fresh Puritan attack against them would encourage him to protect them in order to spite Parliament.[5] On the other hand, public opinion was beginning to condemn the Duke of Buckingham, Charles' favorite, to the purgatory of perpetual adverse criticism. Some Catholics maintained, therefore, that because Buckingham had occasionally encouraged Catholic persecution Parliament would oppose it in the hope of discrediting him.[6]

Charles I's second Parliament convened early in February, 1626, and scarcely three weeks passed before the House of Commons turned its attention to religious matters. On March 4 a bill to restrain the emigration of Catholic children to the continent was left for study with the Committee for Religion. Two days later John Pym moved that Simon Dormer, "a Popish Schoolmaster in Suffolke," be sum-

[2] Wallace Notestein, *The Winning of the Initiative by the House of Commons* (London, 1924), *passim.*

[3] *Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports, Skrine Manuscripts* (London, 1887), I, 5, 25-26; hereafter cited as *Skrine MSS.* John Rushworth, *Historical Collections* (London, 1721), I, 173-176, 209-211.

[4] *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian Series* (London, 1858), XIX, 325; this source will be cited hereafter as *S.P., Venetian.*

[5] *Skrine MSS.*, I, 49.

[6] *S.P., Venetian,* XIX, 351.

moned to answer charges of recusancy.[7] Shortly thereafter (March 20), the lower house approved a "Presentment of Recusants," a list of known or suspected Catholics in each county. It had been drawn up to supply the Commons with full information regarding the strength of Catholicism so that a comprehensive program of control might begin. Only a few commoners,[8] one of them a Catholic, opposed adoption of the presentment.[9] So great was the fear of Catholics in government, in fact, that the Commons considered, but did not approve, a proposal to investigate the Lords for recusancy.[10]

The Committee for Religion,[11] one of the most powerful policy-making groups in the lower house, exercised wide authority in religious matters and stood above all as the most efficient agency opposing the Catholic Church in England. It framed bills, presentments, and remonstrances to be debated in the Commons, created sub-committees to examine special problems, inquired into the recusancy of even sickly or imprisoned Catholics, censored "popish" books, and employed pursuivants[12] to ferret out Catholics.[13] John Pym, chairman of this

[7] *Journals of the House of Commons* (London, 1803), I, 826-838; this source will be referred to subsequently as *C.J.* The members of the Commons' Committee for Religion included Sirs Arthur Temple, Thomas Hobby, Richard Buller, Henry Anderson, Francis Barrington, and John Pym (chairman).

[8] Among them were Sir George Perkins and Reynold Edwards. *C.J.*, I, 828.

[9] *S.P., Venetian*, XIX, 358. *C.J.*, I, 837-838.

[10] *C.J.*, I, 853-854.

[11] *Ibid.*, I, 857. The Committee for Religion during the second Parliament consisted of John Pym (chairman), Sir Thomas Hobby, Sir George More, Robert Harley, Thomas Denton, Edward Peyton, Sir Dudley Digges, and Edward Spencer. From time to time others were added to consider special problems.

[12] The pursuivants, men of average birth, infamous character, and amoral convictions, were a type of seventeenth-century secret service commissioned by the crown with extraordinary authority as well as with opportunities for lucrative financial gain for the purpose of trapping and incriminating Catholics. The king's messengers, as they were called, concealed their identity as much as possible, and were sometimes admitted even into the homes of Catholics where Mass was sung. We have a good deal of information on their methods but little biographical material. For details of one of them, James Wadsworth, cf. the *Dictionary of National Biography* (London, 1908), XX, 425-426. The following sources in England give details on the pursuivants and their methods of trapping recusants; Archives of the Archdiocese of Westminster, Roman Letters MSS., 1624-1636, and Anglia A MSS., VIII, Westminster Cathedral, London; Sir John Bankes MSS., Bundles 6, 44, and 72, Bodleian Library, Oxford University; Privy Council Registers MSS., 1633-1634 (ff. 241, 420-21, and 470), and 1638 (ff. 47, 102, 137, and 208), Public Record Office, London.

[13] *C.J.*, I, 851.

influential committee, directed its work with an unobtrusive though masterly genius that was to make him undisputed manager of the Commons in the early years of the Long Parliament. Scarcely a week passed that he did not report on measures that his committee had drawn up to curb recusancy.

A general letter, ordering judges to prosecute recusants regardless of person or rank, and to notify the crown of all Catholics who had been indicted for violation of the penal laws[14] that Attorney General Robert Heath[15] despatched to every circuit judge, was probably inspired and drawn up by Pym. His instructions were explicit: recusancy fines were to be deposited in a special fund "employed for the service of the Commonwealth"; judges should be particularly diligent in their prosecution of Catholic schoolmasters; and married women recusants must be imprisoned without privilege of bail unless their husbands redeemed their liberty by a regular £10 monthly fine.[16]

In conjunction with these orders Heath commissioned John Tendring, Marshal of Middlesex, to search the Clink, a prison in Southwark reserved largely for Catholic priests. Tendring, Sir George Paul, a justice of the peace in Surrey, and several pursuivants met at 6:00 a.m. on Good Friday, April 7, to examine the grounds. In spite of resistance by the prison warden, they found four priests living in unusual comfort and allegedly practicing their faith openly. One of these priests, Thomas Preston,[17] occupied a four-room apart-

[14] There have been no recent studies of the penal laws. For old surveys cf. Christopher Anstey, *A Guide to the Laws of England affecting Roman Catholics* (London, 1879), and Richard Madden, *The History of the Penal Laws enacted against Roman Catholics* (London, 1847). Neither of these is complete or entirely satisfactory. Two excellent studies which show the application of the penal laws in the late Tudor and early Stuart periods are Gordon Albion, *Charles I and Rome: A Study in Seventeenth Century Diplomacy* (London, 1935), pp. 7, 37, 76, 81, 103 ff., and Philip Hughes, *The Reformation in England* (New York, 1954), III, 27-33, 275-276, 348-349.

[15] Sir Robert Heath (1575-1649) was, in turn, recorder of London, solicitor-general, and member of Parliament for East Grinstead, Sussex, before being appointed attorney-general in October, 1625. He was a strong Anglican and monarchist until his death at Calais. *D.N.B.*, IX, 346-348.

[16] Rushworth, *op. cit.*, I, 212.

[17] Thomas Preston, alias Roger Widdrington, O.S.B., was indicted for being a priest at the Middlesex quarter sessions on February 15, 1604. He appears to have been free in 1610, and again in 1630, having spent many of the intervening years on the continent or in the Clink. He died in an English prison on April 3, 1640. Preston did promote the acceptance of the oath of allegiance by Catho-

ment in the Bishop of Winchester's New Prison in Maiden Lane which connected with his cell in the Clink by a concealed passage through the prison yard. In addition, Preston had three servants, a library of books valued at £2,000, and all the necessary articles for the celebration of Mass. He apparently left the prison at will and was permitted visitors. Tendring also uncovered five bags of money, £100 in loose change, and several packets of letters.[18]

While Tendring was searching the Clink, George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, countermanded his warrant, directing him to desist and to confiscate nothing. The Committee for Religion, learning of Tendring's discovery and of Abbot's orders, conducted hearings to determine the actual state of prison life. At the inquiry Abbot testified that Tendring had unjustly molested Preston who was being maintained by the crown even beyond his sentence to protect him from his co-religionists. Preston, Abbot said, had taken the oath of allegiance and had turned state's evidence against certain recusants who were subsequently prosecuted and imprisoned. In return for his co-operation, King James I had instructed Abbot and Richard Neile, Bishop of Winchester, to provide for him and to allow him full liberty of person and conscience.[19]

Although the luxuries of prison life were undoubtedly exaggerated,[20] the Commons believed the facts surrounding Preston's imprisonment, and renewed its persecution of recusants.[21] In June the Committee for Religion presented the "Petition against Recusants in Authority,"

---

lics, and took it himself, but he later acquiesced because of pressure from Rome. Joseph Gillow, *A Literary and Biographical Dictionary of the English Catholics* (London, 1895-1902), V, 364-365.

[18] Rushworth, *op. cit.*, I, 240-241.

[19] *Ibid.*, I, 242-243.

[20] Rushworth, in reporting on the imprisonment of Preston, cannot be trusted completely, for he was a fervent Puritan who suppressed or excluded certain documents and colored facts to suit his purpose of promoting the Puritan cause. His narrative is generally sound factually, but his interpretations are often slanted in favor of Parliament. *D.N.B.*, XVII, 419-422.

[21] *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, Old Series (London, 1807), II, 79-83, cited hereafter as Hansard. During May, 1626, Parliament was more concerned with its attack against Buckingham and with evading Charles' plea for subsidies than with other grievances. The Lords did, however, draw up articles against John Digby, Earl of Bristol, for allegedly attempting to convert Charles to Catholicism during his Spanish visit in 1623.

which listed the names of Catholics who held important posts in government.[22] For the most part those singled out were peers in the strongly Catholic northern counties where they were mostly commissioners of sewers, justices of the peace, and deputy lieutenants. Two high-ranking administrators, Lord Scroop, Lord President of the Council of the North, and the Earl of Rutland, Lord Lieutenant of Lincoln, were also indicted. The committee charged Rutland with obstructing the prosecution of recusants in the North Riding of York and with supporting Roger Conyers, a Catholic teacher who had previously been refused a license. The charges against Lord Scroop read like a summary of the penal laws: he refused to come to church on holy days and violated them by hawk-hunting; he neither fasted nor received communion; and he employed only recusants as assistants.[23]

The petition was read for the third time during a violent hailstorm that swept over Westminster about 3:00 p.m. on June 12. The heavy downpour undermined the high supporting wall of St. Andrews' Cemetery which caved in and laid open the graves of a dozen men who had been buried the previous year during the plague. The rotting coffins split and threw out ghastly decomposed bodies that were washed down the street in the torrent of rain. God had shown his wrath against the petition, Catholics cried, for "there was [seen] a spirit at the same time upon the waters, which did sore affright all the beholders."[24] The Commons, on the other hand, read this heavenly sign favorably and passed the petition.

The opening passages assured Charles I of the Commons' faith in his true purpose to maintain the purity of the Church of England even though few of its members probably believed a word of his pledge made at Oxford the year before to do so.[25] They commended him for avoiding the Spanish match of 1623, and exhorted him to execute the penal laws in spite of his marriage to a Catholic, Henrietta

[22] *C.J.*, I, 865-867. The list of recusants in public office and the charges against each of them is in Rushworth, *op. cit.*, I, 392-396.

[23] Rushworth, *op. cit.*, I, 392-394. Lord Scroop was also charged with encouraging the growth of recusancy in the north country during his presidency of the Council of the North from 1619 to 1626 when 1,670 Catholics were indicted and prosecuted for violations of the penal laws.

[24] *Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports, Rutland Manuscripts* (London, 1888), IV, 477.

[25] Hansard, II, 36.

Maria.[26] The Commons' distrust and dislike of the queen's French suite at Somerset House found expression in an article which condemned the residence of "fruitless Ambassadors" who spied for Cardinal Richelieu while growing fat on English stipends too large for their station and needs.[27] Since Charles had recently expelled Henrietta's French attendants, the sanction of the lower house in this was all the more welcome. The king accepted each article of the petition without dispute, but he lost patience when the Commons began to speak of Buckingham's impeachment. Parliament was dissolved on June 15.

Approximately nineteen months passed before Charles' pressing need of money forced him to call his third Parliament. By the end of the first week in March, 1628, he learned that once more Puritans would be numerous in the lower house, and that they intended to renew agitation for religious reform because he had failed to enforce the penal laws against Catholics.[28] The king had good reason to be lenient; the Catholics were generous in their contributions to the forced loan while the Protestant gentry, especially those living in the north and in the southwest, preferred to pay heavy fines in Star Chamber rather than to compromise their opposition.[29]

When the Commons once more convened in St. Stephen's Hall it ignored Charles' request for subsidies. The business of every session followed a similar pattern. Charles summoned Parliament to solicit funds, but invariably the members first advanced grievances against Buckingham and the Catholics, or passed resolutions strengthening their own prerogatives. Petitions for religious reform appeared regularly, and Charles invariably accepted them in the hope that money would then be voted. But the Commons would grant not a shilling until the king's positive action against Catholics proved his promises. Four years and three sessions of Parliament passed before it became clear that the latter, quite apart from its genuine fear of Catholicism, was using the issue of religious reform as a calculated means of weakening Charles' prerogatives. The king realized full well that he faced a constitutional crisis, but he saw no solution to

[26] *Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports, Montague Manuscripts* (London, 1926), III, 260.

[27] Rushworth, *op. cit.*, I, 207.

[28] *Skrine MSS.*, I, 141.

[29] Lucy Aikin, *Memoirs of the Court of King Charles the First* (Philadelphia, 1833), I, 134.

it short of dissolution of Parliament which was at best a temporary expedient. He could not carry on effective government without money voted by the Commons, yet he could not live in strength and peace with it.

In the spring of 1628 the lower house renewed the extraordinary authority practiced by the Committee for Religion since 1625, and took measures to purge its membership of Catholics who had thus far concealed their faith, or who had retained their seats through royal patronage. Every Monday and Saturday afternoon during a parliamentary session the committee met at two o'clock to consider questions involving religion, and to recommend an agenda to be debated the following week in the committee of the whole. At one of these Monday meetings the Committee for Religion, with the subsequent sanction of both houses, resolved to hold a day of fast and communion on April 6 in St. Margaret's, the Commons' church just across the road from Westminster Hall. A special sub-committee for religion composed of Sirs William Bulstrode, Miles Fleetwood, James Perrott, Robert Harley, Edward Giles, and Robert Pye issued certificates to all parliamentarians who took the sacrament on the appointed day. Anyone who refused to take the eucharist according to the Anglican rite was excluded from Parliament until he complied with the order.[30] About the same time the Lords petitioned Charles to execute the penal laws rigidly, and to restrain the activities of Henrietta's Oratorian priests who were said to be "subverting" the faith of her Anglican subjects by preaching in the streets.[31] But Parliament was merely warming up to the major religious grievance of this session.

The important business in the Commons, the Clerkenwell incident, provided fresh "evidence" of Catholic plans to execute a successful gunpowder plot. A few days before the opening of Parliament on March 17, 1628, George Long, a justice of the peace in Middlesex, discovered that the former home of John Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, in Clerkenwell just outside of London, was being used as the head-

[30] *C.J.*, I, 873. I have not found any record of those who refused the sacrament. One wonders whether left-wing Puritans were also obliged to meet this requirement.

[31] Frances H. Relf, *Notes of the Debates in the House of Lords, 1621, 1625, 1628* (London, 1929), pp. 64-65; cited subsequently as *Lord's Debates.*

quarters of a small community of Jesuits.[32] They were arrested and their goods and papers were seized. The value of the goods was slight,[33] but the letters taken revealed Jesuit missionary activity as well as facts surrounding their dispute with Richard Smith, titular Bishop of Chalcedon, then resident in England. As there seemed nothing treasonable in the papers, someone, probably Charles, instructed Principal Secretary Sir John Coke to draw up a forged letter that was slipped in with the correspondence. This letter suggested that the Jesuits were collaborating with the Commons to discredit Buckingham.[34] Charles hoped thereby to use anti-Catholic public opinion to stop the Commons' criticism of the duke and to humiliate it into granting subsidies.[35]

The suggestions of the Commons' collusion with papists aroused Pym's suspicions, and he summoned Coke and Heath to testify before the Committee for Religion. Coke alleged that French ambassadors directed popish plots, and that the Jesuits had planned to meet with them at Clerkenwell on St. Joseph's Day (March 17)[36] to make final arrangements for their conspiracy.[37] Heath preferred to submit a written report, "The Discovery of the Jesuits' College at Clerkenwell,"[38] which he turned over to Pym. This report explained that the Privy Council had suspected Jesuit activity at Clerkenwell since Christmas, 1627, when it assigned several pursuivants to watch the Shrewsbury house. Soon afterward, Heath wrote, Justice Long and a pursuivant, Humphrey Cross, searched the premises wherein they

[32] *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1628-1629* (London, 1859), pp. 20, 53; hereafter cited *S.P., Domestic*. Seven of the ten Jesuits arrested were Daniel Stanhope, Edward Moore, George Holland (alias Guido Holt), Joseph Underhill (alias Thomas Poulton), Thomas Weedon, Edward Parr, and Robert Beaumont.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 86. Humphrey Cross, Justinian Povey, and Long estimated the value of the goods at £164. They also found £7.13s.9d in ready cash.

[34] Samuel R. Gardiner, *History of England, 1603-1642* (London, 1884), VI, 238-239.

[35] John G. Nichols, *The Discovery of the Jesuits' College at Clerkenwell in March 1626-28* (London, 1825), p. 5; cited hereafter as *Discovery at Clerkenwell. S.P., Venetian* (London, 1916), XXI, 46.

[36] The feast of St. Joseph is today celebrated on March 19; in the seventeenth century it was on the seventeenth.

[37] *C.J.*, I, 876.

[38] Heath's "Discovery" is reprinted fully in Nichols, *Discovery at Clerkenwell*, pp. 21-30.

captured several men hiding in the basement behind a newly bricked-over wall. The prisoners refused to admit their priesthood, but their "massing stuff" and letters proved to be "sufficient evidence" to incriminate them.[39]

As proof of the proposed Jesuit plot, Heath drew attention to the forged letter which he said had been written by a Jesuit to his superior in Brussels. Heath emphasized that this letter proved the imminence of a Jesuit conspiracy, although he cautiously discredited the Commons' collaboration in it, and the Committee for Religion believed him. In fact, Charles' plan worked so well that even William Prynne, the Puritan pamphleteer, accepted Heath's testimony.[40] Heath and Coke purposely distorted the truth in order to use the Clerkenwell discovery as an engine of political pressure. The Commons did not know that the letter was a forgery, and that the St. Joseph's Day meeting had been called to conduct the ordinary business of the Jesuit community—the promotion of novices.[41] But the Commons did not surrender its case against Buckingham.

The talk of Catholic plots that followed the arrest of the Jesuits precipitated another joint petition by the Lords and Commons to enforce the penal laws. The Clerkenwell papers show that Catholics not only supported a bishop and a full staff of lesser ecclesiastical officers in England, but also that they subsidized five communities of Jesuits and Benedictines.[42] The lower house could not quite understand how such an extensive organization could have been maintained in spite of the enforcement of the penal laws, and in searching for the answer some members even suggested that Charles I had made a pact with the Catholics whereby he had promised to restrain recusancy proceedings against them if they would help fill his treasury. Moreover, the Commons realized that many English Catholic children who were sent to the continent for training in Jesuit colleges ultimately returned as missionary priests, and it proposed that this be prevented by adopting recusants' children as wards of the state to insure that they be raised in "true religion."[43]

The "Petition of both Houses Concerning Enforcing the Laws against Recusants" was passed on March 29, 1628, and submitted for

[39] The forged letter is in Rushworth, *op. cit.*, I, 474-476.
[40] Nichols, *Discovery at Clerkenwell*, p. 12.
[41] *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.
[42] Relf, *Lords' Debates*, p. 69.
[43] *S.P., Venetian*, XXI, 46.

Charles' approval two days later. It recounted all the old grievances against Catholics and asked especially that the Jesuits be restrained. In it, Parliament told of the Catholics' increasing boldness in accepting a bishop to direct their activities (it knew little of the great controversy then raging among the regular clergy over the need of a Catholic bishop with extraordinary jurisdiction); the regular orders had re-established religious houses dissolved in Henry VIII's time; and Catholics had grown so strong that they had even attempted the election of an assembly to challenge the authority of Parliament. The petition also advised Charles to confine Catholic priests to the prison castle of Wisbeck as his father had done, and to prohibit Catholics to come within ten miles of London. In addition, Parliament noted that the composition of recusants' farms since 1625 had brought in great revenue, yet through fraud and "patched up . . . colourable leases, contracts, and preconveyences" little of the money was actually deposited with the exchequer. While Parliament agreed to permit Catholic ambassadors their chapels, it vehemently refused to tolerate the attendance at them by English Catholics.[44]

Again Charles I accepted the petition and swore to "keep Religion amongst us free from Innovation and Corruption."[45] At last the Commons consented to grant him subsidies totalling 1,500,000 crowns which would be paid in five installments: two in July, two more in December, and the last in March, 1629. To meet this expense the commoners authorized a general tax throughout the realm. As might have been expected, recusants were penalized by having to pay twice the ordinary amount of the tax.[46]

Scarcely had Parliament completed its petition than it turned to discuss other grievances. Its debates culminated in the appointment of a Grand Committee for the Remonstrance of Both Houses under the direction of John Pym, John Selden, Sir John Eliot, and Sir Thomas Wentworth.[47] The remonstrance raised eight points or "Heads of Articles" pertaining to religion, innovations in government, and grievances against the administration of Buckingham. In the first article, "Fear of innovation in Religion," the Commons

[44] Hansard, II, 248-251. Cf. also *Skrine MSS.*, p. 144; *S.P., Domestic, 1628-1629*, p. 47; and Aikin, *Memoirs of King Charles*, I, 133.

[45] *C.J.*, I, 880.

[46] *Skrine MSS.*, pp. 145, 151. *S.P., Venetian*, XXI, 104.

[47] *C.J.*, I, 911. The Commons passed the remonstrance on June 10, 1628.

accused the Countess of Buckingham, the duke's mother, of assisting papists, and criticized Bishops Neile and Laud for preaching popery in St. Paul's Cathedral.[48] The lower house further decried the alarming increase of recusancy, particularly in London, and denounced the liberty of conscience permitted Catholics through the composition of their farms. The members demanded that the penal laws be enforced to prevent Catholics further influencing persons of quality who protected them. Lastly, the Commons reminded the king a third time that he had promised three years before at Oxford to insure the purity of the English Church.[49]

About the same time the Lords' Committee on Recusants and the Commons' Committee for Religion jointly submitted a bill "To restrain the Passing or Sending of Any to be Popishly-Bred Beyond the Seas." The bill was read and approved by the lower house on June 20, 1628,[50] and after a conference with the Lords the act was passed.[51] It did not differ essentially from its predecessor of 1603 (I Jac. I, c. 4) : anyone who permitted his child to attend a Catholic continental school or seminary, or who supported students already overseas, was liable to the loss of his property and income. The customary "escape clause" was re-enacted whereby those who returned to England within six months, and then took the oath of allegiance, were excused from punishment.[52] The remonstrance then went to Charles at Whitehall.

This time he would not accept it. He had listened to harangues against his wife's suite, Catholics, and Buckingham, and while he cared little for the welfare of his Catholic subjects, and nothing for Henrietta's French attendants, he was deeply grieved and annoyed with Parliament's continual criticism of his favorite. The time was ripe for Buckingham's dismissal, but the king would hear nothing of it. Instead, Parliament was prorogued for the third time, and Charles issued a proclamation commanding the strict enforcement of the penal laws in the hope that, perhaps, then the commoners would recognize his desire to please them.[53] But they could no longer be fooled by such obvious tactics.

[48] *Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports, Cowper Manuscripts* (London, 1888), I, 349-350.

[49] *S.P., Venetian,* XXI, 170-171.

[50] *C.J.,* I, 914-915.

[51] Relf, *Lords' Debates,* pp. 228-229.

[52] *Statutes,* 3 Charles I, c. 2 (1628).

[53] *Skrine MSS.,* p. 160.

Buckingham's murder at the hands of John Felton temporarily resolved one issue with Parliament. While the duke's bloody body was being carried from Portsmouth to London crowds everywhere cheered Felton as a national hero. The spontaneous reaction to his act demonstrated spectacularly the gulf between the Stuart's inordinate devotion to their friends, and the opposing national sentiments of Puritans, parliamentarians, and townsmen who no longer accepted passive obedience to a stubborn divine right monarch. The fact that Charles had Buckingham buried secretly at night to avoid the threat of Londoners burning his body was evidence of popular indignation over the Stuart policies.[54]

The second session of the third Parliament opened in the third week of January, 1629,[55] and a new Committee for Religion including Sir Walter Earle, William Coryton, Sir Richard Grosvenor, Sir Robert Phelips, Selden, and Pym renewed its study of reforms.[56] Charles sent Coke to request the customary tonnage and poundage, but discussion over it was tabled in favor of debate over grievances in religion. Several Puritans then spoke the usual platitudes that recalled the heritage of the Reformation, pleaded for the preservation of true religion, and warned the lower house of Jesuit trickery which had temporarily "bewitched" even the king. In a brilliant address Pym assailed corruption in the English Church through "Romish" practices, and demanded an inquiry to ascertain the reason for the obvious increase in Catholic recusancy. What men craved, Pym said, was a return to the purity of practice typical of Edward VI's reign (Pym obviously did not know his history), and exemplified in the teaching of Peter Martyr, Martin Bucer, and Thomas Cranmer. Pym advised the lower house to reserve to itself the right of preserving the "purity" of Anglicanism for it was the "only body" which could "meet with these mischiefs"—Catholicism and Arminianism.[57] Pym's plea was highly significant because it left little doubt that he considered Parliament the guardian of purity in the English Church, and he thereby rejected the exclusive sovereignty of the king, high commission, or convocation in ecclesiastical matters. Inspired by these

[54] Henry Ellis, *Original Letters Illustrative of English History* (London, 1827), III, 264-265.

[55] Charles prorogued Parliament from June 15 to October 15, and then delayed its opening until January 20.

[56] *C.J.*, I, 920.

[57] Hansard, II, 443-446.

thrilling words the lower house did not hesitate thereafter to question the motives of even the king. Sir Francis Seymour, in fact, publicly charged that Catholics were unmolested because Charles rescinded every parliamentary resolution to prosecute them. Whatever the Commons did, Seymour said, was undone by the king! At this point Phelips suggested that Parliament hold another day of fast and prayer to insure the success of religious reform, a suggestion which Charles granted but with the sarcastic comment that fasting was becoming an unnecessary adjunct of every parliamentary session.[58]

The Commons did have reason to question Charles I's sincerity, for he had pardoned four Anglican clergymen—Richard Montague, John Cosin, Robert Sybthorpe, and Roger Manwarring—who had been indicted by Parliament for alleged conspiracy to subvert religion. What was worse, of course, was that the king, on his own authority, had pardoned them without the consent of Parliament while it was not in session. When it reconvened there was appointed a special sub-committee on pardons that was to determine upon whose authority the pardons had been granted. The committee learned that Heath had drawn up a general pardon during Michaelmas term upon the direct order of Charles. Heath testified that the indictment against Cosin was based upon his alleged repudiation of the king's sovereignty over the English Church, but that the king knew Cosin, Manwarring, Sybthorpe, and Montague to be loyal. There was no question that Charles would support them rather than acknowledge Parliament's indictment. The lower house, of course, balked at the suggestion of their innocence for it was fighting to maintain its own power, even against ancient claims of royal prerogative. Then William Laud, Bishop of London, who had no part in the pardons, was maligned by Eliot, who charged that Laud represented "all the danger we [Puritans] fear."[59] The Puritans in the Commons obviously hoped to increase their strength at the expense of royal authority. Buckingham had already fallen, and in turn Sir Richard Weston, Sir Thomas Wentworth, and Laud were to bend beneath the terrible weight of parliamentary pressure.

Oliver Cromwell, a young, obscure, but devoted Puritan of the Fens, rose at this point to warn the Commons of "flat Popery" being preached in St. Paul's, and of Neile's and Manwarring's hand in it. Cromwell's speech touched off a new series of condemnations during

[58] *Ibid.*, II, 447-449.

[59] *Ibid.*, II, 458-460.

which many parliamentarians unfolded fresh evidence to prove the menace of Catholicism.[60] If the Commons had not misrepresented the facts surrounding the growth of Catholic power in England and its supposed alliance with the crown, it had mostly certainly ignored factual evidence in presenting a charge upon which it could act in pursuit of its interests.

On February 13 the Committee for Religion turned once more to the examination of details surrounding the capture and imprisonment of the Jesuits of Clerkenwell. With Pym in the chair Sir Walter Earle told the committee that there were three daily Masses sung in the queen's chapel in Somerset House, and that as many as 500 Catholics attended them from time to time, so that it was common for them to ask "Will you go to mass, or have you been at mass at Somerset House?" The threat of Catholicism was so strong in London, Sir Walter continued, that the pardon of the Jesuits imprisoned in Newgate jail was unforgiveable. The committee then learned that no legal process had been taken against the prisoners until December, 1628, when three of them were tried at the Middlesex quarter sessions, and only one of them, whose name is not known, was convicted. Even he was subsequently released.[61] Sir Richard Grosvenor then spoke of how diligently the lower house had worked to stem the growth of popery only to have its efforts reversed by the crown. The Commons alone, he said, had framed a religious petition and an act against recusants; it had re-examined evasions of recusancy fines; and it had even removed papists from political and ecclesiastical offices. Parliament had done everything possible to preserve true religion, yet recusants were not prosecuted and proclamations against them were simply ignored. It was the duty of Parliament under God, Grosvenor concluded, to stop this damnable advance of popery.[62]

Sir Thomas Hobby reported to the special sub-committee that the keeper of Newgate prison had received ten prisoners on December 1, and that two days later three of them were indicted for treason. But Chief Justice Nicholas Hyde, he said, had ordered a stay of execution for the man who had actually been convicted and sentenced to be hanged. Thereafter Sir Edward Sackville, Earl of Dorset, sent instructions to the keeper that "his majesty's pleasure was [that]

[60] *Ibid.*, II, 463-465.
[61] Nichols, *Discovery at Clerkenwell*, p. 12.
[62] Hansard, II, 567-571.

they should be delivered" and released on bond.[63] This testimony prompted Eliot to charge Hyde and Dorset with criminal negligence even though they had only complied with Charles' command. While the Jesuits were undermining the state, Eliot said, "the over-officiousness of ministers of state . . . interpose themselves to preserve these men to all our ruins." The testimony of Secretary Coke confirmed the committee's suspicions that Charles I had authorized the Jesuits' release. Selden, who had been at their trial, said that "plain treason was proved," yet the Jesuits were not punished. The Commons was furious but it was powerless to alter the king's action. It turned instead to keep another day of fast and prayer, and in good Puritan practice to listen to three sermons that were preached in Westminster Abbey.[64]

The following week Parliament adopted a new petition, "The Heads of Articles,"[65] in which the members, undoubtedly with tongue-in-cheek, reaffirmed their faith in the king's strong purpose to maintain the faith, and ascribed the misdirection of religion to the evil influence of his ministers. In England, the Commons said,

> we observe an extraordinary growth of Popery, insomuch that in some counties, where in queen Elizabeth's time there were few or none known Recusants, now there are above 2000, and all the rest generally apt to revolt. A bold and open allowance of their religion, by frequent and public resort to mass, in multitudes, without controul, and that even the queen's court, to the great scandal of his majesty's government. . . .[66]

What were the reasons for the growth of Catholicism, the Commons asked? Its answers read like another Millinery Petition: officers of the crown were negligent in the execution of the penal laws; popish books, especially by Montague and Cosin (staunch Anglicans), were licensed for popular consumption; the purity of the English Church was poisoned by popish practices such as bowing, making the sign of the cross, and using pictures, lights, and images. The Commons recommended the burning of heretical books and the exemplary punishment of recusants. In brief, the "Heads of Articles" proposed the renewal of Catholic persecution, the suppression of Arminian practices, and the unqualified adoption of Puritanism.[67] Immediately after the presentation of the articles, Charles adjourned Parliament until

[63] *Ibid.*, II, 471-474.
[64] *Ibid.*, II, 474-477; Nichols, *Discovery at Clerkenwell*, pp. 14-20.
[65] This petition is in Hansard, II, 483-487.
[66] *Ibid.*, II, 483-485.
[67] *Ibid.*, II, 485-487.

March 2 when Eliot raised his shrill voice above the din of the king's guards who were pounding upon the doors of St. Stephen's. The Commons would be heard and no king would silence it! Eight days later Charles dissolved Parliament. It was not to meet again until 1640.[68]

Did king or Commons enjoy the right to initiate ecclesiastical reform in the early seventeenth century? The Church had been legally and customarily the peculiar province of the crown to be administered with the advice, not the direction, of Parliament. Certainly it knew that by its own law the supreme authority in ecclesiastical affairs rested with the king. The Commons challenged this exclusive right between 1626 and 1629. It acknowledged that Charles was responsible for the maintenance of "pure religion," but it insisted that the Commons, as the voice of the English people, was obliged to guard this purity. Constitutionally, there was no doubt that the king was legally the governor of the Church of England, yet constitutionality in an emotional struggle was unconvincing, even to an Englishman. Ultimately, therefore, the quarrel between king and Commons could never be resolved rationally, for faith, not reason, guided the actions of both. Moreover, the Commons had won the practical right to consider the wisdom of Charles' religious policy; the Great Protestation of 1621 had settled this. It was the means by which the Commons attempted to initiate reform in religious practice that was troublesome, not its concern over religion.

It is difficult to believe that the Commons did not realize, in spite of its strong Puritan flavor, that Catholicism in England was much too weak to challenge the supremacy of the Established Church. In this light the Commons' inordinate concern over the threat of Catholicism appears somewhat out of proportion. Why, then, did the members continue to heap petition upon petition to suppress a small and unorganized group of Catholics who could scarcely live normal lives, let alone conspire successfully to subvert the Church of England? Because the Commons saw that this persecution was a most effective means of forestalling the grant of subsidies. Practical sovereignty in the seventeenth century rested with those who controlled the purse. Suppression of Catholics, therefore, was the result not only of the Puritans' genuine fear of Catholicism, but also a powerful lever by which Parliament hoped to wreck the absolute monarchy.

Kent State University

[68] *Ibid.*, II, 488-492.

BISHOP ELDER AND THE CIVIL WAR

By
Willard E. Wight*

William Henry Elder, Bishop of Natchez, was that rarity among the bishops of the Catholic Church in the South, a native southerner. Born in Baltimore, Maryland, on March 22, 1819, Elder studied for the priesthood at Mount Saint Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Maryland, and at the Urban College of Propaganda in Rome. Following his ordination, he returned to the United States where he served as a professor and later as president of Mount Saint Mary's. He was consecrated as third Bishop of Natchez in May, 1857, and thus became the spiritual leader of all Catholics in the State of Mississippi.[1]

The nomination and election of Abraham Lincoln to the presidency of the United States and the civil war following the formation of the Confederate States of America divided not only the political body of the nation but also many of the religious groups. While the Protestant sects were torn apart, the Catholic Church was spared that misfortune. The bishops of the North and South, however, differed in their approach to the problem. In general the northern bishops supported the Union while those of the South defended the rights of the states and were abettors of the Confederacy.[2] The key to the political position of Bishop Elder throughout the period of secession and war was clearly expressed in a letter to the Bishop of Chicago in February, 1861:

I hold it is the duty of all Catholics in the seceding states to adhere to the actual government without reference to the rights or the wisdom of

---

* Mr. Wight is a member of the Department of Social Sciences in the Georgia Institute of Technology. This article was originally read as a paper at the annual meeting of the Mississippi Historical Society at Natchez on February 16, 1957.

[1] In 1880 Elder was transferred to Cincinnati as coadjutor to Archbishop John B. Purcell with the right of succession. From the death of Purcell in July, 1883, Elder was Archbishop of Cincinnati until his own death on October 31, 1904. The period of Elder's episcopacy in Natchez is covered in Richard O. Gerow, *Cradle Days of St. Mary's* (Natchez, 1941), pp. 133-196.

[2] Benjamin J. Blied, *Catholics and the Civil War* (Milwaukee, 1945), pp. 86-69, treats in some small detail the attitudes of the bishops of the North and South.

making the separation—or the grounds for it—our state government & our new Confederation are *de facto* our *only existing* government here and it seems to me as good citizens we are bound not only to acquiesce in it but to support it & contribute means & arms & above all to avoid weakening it by division of counsel without necessity.[3]

Even though disunion was so exceedingly painful to him that he would have cheerfully made any personal sacrifice that could have hindered it, Elder advised his clergy in an episcopal circular in November, 1860, that:

it is not for us here to discuss the question connected with our situation. It is enough to know that it has been found necessary to summon the Legislature of our State, "to take into consideration" in the words of the Governor's Proclamation, "the propriety and necessity of providing surer and better safeguards for the lives, liberties and property of citizens" and that every man is solemnly impressed with the conviction that the present time demands the exercise of every virtue and the generous discharge of every duty.[4]

Again, in his Lenten pastoral of January, 1861, he advised his people that "with regard to our political affairs, we shall not speak now more than to remind you how entirely we depend on the favor of God to establish peace and prosperity."[5]

Perhaps, it was because of his recollections of the strongly anti-Catholic Nativist and Know-Nothing movements that had not long before swept over the United States, that Elder was most insistent that there be no identification of the Church with the secession movement. For this reason he was greatly disturbed that the Catholic papers in the South seemed too disposed to identify religion with the cause of the South. An article entitled "Les Catholiques

[3] Elder to Bishop James Duggan, Natchez, February 19, 1861, Elder Letterbook VI, 65. Unless otherwise indicated all letters are in the Elder Letterbooks in the archives of the Diocese of Natchez-Jackson. The Roman numeral indicates the letterbook and the Arabic numeral indicates the page in the same. All letters were written from Natchez and are letter press copies. Use of the materials in the diocesan archives was graciously granted to the writer by the Most Reverend Richard O. Gerow, Bishop of Natchez-Jackson.

[4] Elder to Archbishop Francis Patrick Kenrick, Natchez, April 12, 1861, Archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, 29-D-11; New York *Tablet*, December 22, 1860. Citations from the Baltimore archives are through the courtesy of the Reverend Paul L. Love, former archivist.

[5] Baltimore *Catholic Mirror*, February 9, 1861.

du Sud" in the *Propagateur Catholique* of New Orleans[6] evoked a protest from the Bishop of Natchez to the priest-editor. He begged that there be further explanation in the next issue of a point which to him seemed ambiguous. He told Father Napoleon J. Perché:

> In the four points in which you seem to say the Catholics of the South are agreed—conscientiously—do you mean precisely the right of secession—as distinguished from the right of self-preservation? I have heard three grounds given for our separation from the Union. Some say the Union was a kind of free association which any state had a right to forsake whenever she judged it conducive to her interests:—the right of secession. Others say it was a perpetual compact in intention but that other parties have unjustly broken it—we were released not so much by the direct violation of the compact on the part of Northern States—but by the right of self preservation—because it was impossible for us to live in the Union & we had a right to provide for our safety outside of it. . . .
>
> Now any of these positions is perfectly consistent with Catholic morality —with the highest patriotism. And as you seem to speak in the name of the Catholics of the South—it is important that you do not appear to commit them to one or the other of these views.[7]

Elder conceded, of course, that the editor was at liberty to express his own views, but he cautioned that "when you write as a representative of *all of us* & declare what *our* opinions are you must . . . make your statements of our opinions more clear to all."[8]

To counteract the impression conveyed by the Catholic press, Elder suggested to the Bishop of Chicago the writing of an article not, as he said, "over your name but in a tone that will make it be accepted as a sound Catholic statement," explaining that the bishops must not be thought of as endorsing all the opinions of Catholic editors, for the episcopacy did not recognize newspapers as the proper media for expressing authoritative decisions on morals. An editor's opinion, Elder maintained, had "only the authority that each individual chooses to give it." The origin of such a statement in the South, he believed, would be misunderstood and "would really disaffect some Catholics from their political duty who would infer that in order to keep to the spirit of good Catholics they ought to hold off from our de facto government."[9] The caution concerning the identification of the Church with secession was likewise carried into

[6] January 26, 1861.
[7] Elder to Perché, February 4, 1861, VI, 37.
[8] *Ibid.*
[9] Elder to Duggan, February 19, 1861, VI, 65.

Elder's relations with his flock, but he did not hesitate to advise Catholics who consulted him personally. In a letter to the Archbishop of Baltimore the Natchez prelate stated:

> My course, & I believe the course of my clergy, has been not to recommend secession—but to explain to those who might enquire, that if they were satisfied, dispassionately that secession was the only practical remedy, the only means of safety—their religion did not forbid them to advocate it:—on the contrary they were bound to do, what they believed the safety of the community required: & that the oath of naturalization did not hinder one who had taken it, from doing any thing that it was lawful for native citizens to do.—And since the secession has been accomplished,—I have advised even those who thought it unwise still to support our State government and the new Confederacy—as being the only government which exists here *de facto*. I have encouraged all to give a hearty support—to enroll as soldiers—to go forward with their taxes—to cooperate in any way they have occasion for. But I have told them to do all this as good citizens and not to refer to the Church as having decided either for or against the propriety of secession.[10]

No such moderation was practiced by some of the prelates of the North. A short time after the beginning of the war Archbishops Hughes of New York and Purcell of Cincinnati displayed the American flag on their cathedrals, an example that was shortly followed by the Bishops of Pittsburgh, Milwaukee, and Philadelphia. Furthermore, Archbishop Hughes defended the display of the flag on the grounds that he did not wish reports that the Catholics were disloyal, for if that occurred "no act of ours afterward could sufficiently vindicate us from the imputation."[11]

This "war fever," as he termed it, pained Bishop Elder so greatly that he wondered, as he told the Bishop of Charleston, if there was "anything that we of the South can & ought to do to abate the war fever among the clergy & Catholic laity of the North?"[12] He deplored the northern propaganda which pictured the southern people as acting in the heat of passion. To a correspondent in Pittsburgh he wrote that "it is a mistake to attribute the action of the South to a sally of passion or to a fractious minority. As far as I can see, there

[10] Elder to Kenrick, Natchez, no date, Archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, 29-D-12.

[11] Blied, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

[12] Elder to Patrick N. Lynch, July 16, 1861, VI, 265.

is almost entire union among all classes & interests."[13] Neither could he bring himself to accept the term "disloyal" as applicable to the course of the southern people. From what he had seen and heard he was satisfied, as he told Bishop Duggan, "that the great body of the people have acted conscientiously according to their sense of duty. . . . here in Natchez, there has been no excitement—but just a calm movement as of men who now simply go on, day after day, seeing & doing their duty. The only enthusiasm that has been displayed, was in the celebration of Washington's Birth Day. . . . I give our people the credit of having proceeded as far as I know with coolness & conscientiousness."[14]

A few days before the occupation of his see city by Union troops in 1863 in a letter to William G. McCloskey, Rector of the American College in Rome, the bishop reviewed the events of the preceding two years.

My own feeling is much yours, one of sadness rather. I thought at first, as you do, that the movement was rash, & that the South ought rather to have relied on "Constitutional remedies." There was a large party here who held that opinion & if there had been anything like a spirit of conciliation shown by the leaders of the party coming into power in the North it is very probable that the peace & Union men here wd. have grown strong enough to hinder secession or to bring about a reconstruction in a short time. But the "fire eaters" in the South maintained that the new party in the North wd. not be restrained by any constitutional provisions; that they were fanatics bent on gaining an end, & they wd. use any means that might seem of necessity for accomplishing their objects which they declared to be "superior to any Constitution & to the Bible" & that the Democratic party wd. not have the power or the will to resist them. The scornful treatment of all attempts at compromise in Congress seemed to confirm the sagacity of their views & I must confess that the progress of events in the north has persuaded me the constitution would have afforded little or no protection. The final thing that shocked my convictions in the prospect was their setting aside the whole power of the United States Courts and the contempt with which they treated the old man we all venerated so much—Roger B. Taney. Now there is avowedly a concentration of all power in the Presid't alone on the grounds of necessity wh. wd. have authorized them to do anything they judged requisite for the safety of the country if they had the South in their

[13] Elder to the Reverend James Keogh, March 14, 1861, VI, 132.
[14] Elder to Duggan, March 5, 1861, VI, 96.

power. The last link in the chain, showing the fanaticism that prevails is the approval by [General] Rosecrans, a practical Catholic, of the policy of starving the inhabitants, breaking up their plowshares, & driving unoffending *women & children* from their houses down into the Southern lines, to make the South feed them & so increase the chances of all starving together. This shows how little reliance cd. be placed on the power of constitutions or even of the universal laws of Christian nations, to protect us against fanaticism. The whole conduct of the war is in keeping. Tho occasionally a gentlemanly officer shows himself superior to his position—but generally they avow their determination to subjugate & etermination [*sic*]. So that I have become persuaded that there must have been a very deep seated and wide spread hatred against the South, before the election of 1860 & which wd. have brought on the despoliation of the Union in some other way, when the South wd. have been more entirely at the mercy of the Black Republicans, holding entire control of Army, Navy, Post Office & all Federal property.[15]

The despoliation of the South, nonetheless, proceeded apace as the war progressed. As early as October, 1861, Bishop Elder resolved to put off further visitation of his diocese until a more favorable time because of the unsettled state of public affairs and of the need for economy.[16] He soon began conserving his financial resources in anticipation of the effects which the war might produce, and he advised one of his priests against building a school "during the present disturbed state of public affairs" because the possibility of war would "probably hinder parents from sending their children away to school."[17] With the advent of war Elder told another priest that he was "unable to form any judgment of what is to be the result—& consequently I can form no project with confidence."[18]

On April 19, 1861, President Lincoln proclaimed the blockade of the southern ports and the gradual strengthening of this limitation on trade with foreign countries was soon felt within the Confederacy. This, coupled with the system of impressment of supplies and the gradual breakdown of the railroads as a means of distribution, soon brought a scarcity of foodstuffs in many parts of the new nation. Passage of the armies through areas of the South also served to bring the people almost to the point of starvation. These scarcities made it necessary for the Bishop of Natchez to exercise his discre-

[15] Elder to McCloskey, June 23, 1863, VIII, 435.
[16] Elder to Mother DeSales, October 19, 1861, VII, 131.
[17] Elder to the Reverend Henry LeDuc, January 25, 1861, VI, 5.
[18] Elder to the Reverend Julian M. Gillou, April 23, 1861, VI, 181.

tionary powers in the matter of the observance of Lent by his people. Instead of the forty days of abstinence, only Fridays and the Ember days were so designated during the Lenten seasons after 1861. The great scarcity and costliness of abstinence foods in Mississippi made it virtually impossible for the greater portion of the Catholics to obtain them, and rather than raise the fear of perplexing their conscience, Elder determined to lighten the burden of observing Lent.[19]

In addition to limiting the traditional observance of Lent the bishop experienced trouble in procuring the necessary materials for the ceremonies of the Church. In April, 1862, therefore, he asked the Archbishop of New Orleans to consecrate holy oils as he found it difficult to secure olive oil.[20] A year later he reported to his clergy that he had learned with a great deal of pain "that some of the Priests of the Diocese have been compelled to cease offering the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass except on Sundays, for the want of wine." Even in the cathedral at Natchez one ordinary bottle of wine had been made to answer for thirty Masses. By April, 1863, a supply had been obtained which, according to Elder, "with suitable economy in the use of it is sufficient to enable every Priest in the Diocese to offer Mass every day for more than a year when new wine of the next vintage may be procured." As a result of the experiment at the cathedral it was estimated that each priest would need only eighteen bottles per year.[21]

The fall of New Orleans to the Federals in April, 1862, likewise cut off Bishop Elder's customary source of religious publications. As the year drew to a close he became uneasy about procuring copies of the *ordo,* the calendar of offices and feasts, for the following year. He appealed to the Bishop of Charleston for assistance and asked to be allowed to share in any arrangements which had been made for securing the desired publications.[22] Apparently uncertain of so remote a point as a source of supply, he approached Bishop Auguste Martin of Natchitoches with the proposition that they publish their own *ordo.* Should it not be completed before the end of 1862, Elder wondered "how would it do to publish it in separate numbers, three or six months at a time?" The expense, he believed, could be reduced somewhat

[19] Elder to the Reverend Francis Orlandi, February 27, 1862, VII, 332.

[20] Elder to John M. Odin, April 5, 1862, VII, 449.

[21] Elder to the Clergy of the Diocese of Natchez, April 1, 1863, VIII, 346.

[22] Elder to Lynch, October 16, 1862, Archives of the Diocese of Charleston, Envelope 135.

by bringing it out in English or French, for in the absence of the *Catholic Almanac,* a Baltimore publication, as he said, "it would probably be purchased to some extent by the laity; especially with some little additions easy to make—as a separate list of feast & fast days & some of the chief indulgences."[23] If this plan was ever carried out, no copy of the publication is extant.

As the war wore on and the necessities of life became more and more scarce, there was a steady rise in the price of everything for sale and this became the root of all the evil in the Confederacy. The supplies of many articles were decreasing, and many engaged in speculative efforts. The extortionists were castigated by the politicians, the clergy, and the newspapers. Bishop Elder, too, became concerned about extortion, but before making any pronouncement upon the matter he sought the advice of John Quinlan, Bishop of Mobile. "Where is the line to be drawn between lawful gains and extortiant ones?" he asked. "Theologians have granted that a man may buy at the lowest market price and sell at the highest for the market price is kept from growing exorbitant by the competition of the sellers."[24] Under the current circumstances, Elder saw no check to the rise of prices unless the purchasers could not get the money or unless they preferred suffering privations to paying a large price. The problem could thus be phrased: "Are men at liberty then to raise the price as high as they feel people willing to give? If not how high can they go?"[25]

Elder was not unaware that the vendors had a case, for he wrote:

> On the side of these exorbitant sellers, it is said that all prices are conventional, there is no *intrinsic* relation between an article & a certain amount of money. Values always rise in proportion to scarcity & demand & if the price is twenty times greater than it was, the simple reason is that the scarcity is greater. That only if there were enough to supply the wants of all, the prices would fall, & since there are not enough for all; it is fair that those should have the article who feel the need of it so much as to give the highest price for it. At the same time, the seller says he is doing no business except in those few articles—he is paying his rent & other expenses & he in turn is obliged to give enormous prices for everything he uses for himself and family.[26]

---

[23] Elder to Martin, November 19, 1862, VIII, 166.
[24] Elder to Quinlan, November 17, 1862, VIII, 161.
[25] *Ibid.* [26] *Ibid.*

What was to be done, Elder asked the Bishop of Mobile? Ought any instructions to be given on the subject in the pulpit or otherwise? One solution that he envisioned was to compel the extortioners to make restitution or to require them to give especially large alms for penance.

Another effect of the blockade was to deny religious books to the soldiers. In December, 1861, the bishop addressed himself to the adjutant of the 18th Mississippi Regiment which contained two Natchez companies:

> I have collected a few books & papers. The blockade has reduced our number of Catholic books & we have given many to the soldiers leaving here. Still I have a few. Of the papers many are a little on the solemn side but when time drags heavy in camp, they may be found to have some interest & if they are not worn out they may serve at best for bed clothes. They say that a newspaper laid in between the bedclothes, two blankets for example, adds wonderfully to the nonconduction power of the blankets. Of course you will have to bargain that there be no rain fall on them.[27]

To Chaplain Francis Pont, former pastor of the church at Jackson, Elder sent fifty copies in English of the pro-slavery sermon that Bishop Augustin Verot of St. Augustine had preached early in 1861 "to be distributed as you judge it will do the most good."[28] Although the Catholic Church did not engage in the printing of tracts for the soldiers, Elder's correspondence indicates that he was not unaware of the great activity among the Protestants in printing and circulating tracts in the army camps.[29]

Reading matter for Catholics in Confederate military service was but a minor concern to the bishop when compared with the problem of supplying chaplains. At the outbreak of hostilities the Diocese of Natchez had fifteen churches, plus twenty-eight preaching stations served by sixteen priests.[30] Two of these priests had accompanied the departing troops at the beginning of the war and soon thereafter the priest at Jackson was commissioned a chaplain. Despite this drain on his meager resources, when Elder received a letter from a Mississippi regiment at Manassas, Virginia, he resolved that if the Bishop

[27] Elder to John E. Elliott, December 10, 1861, VII, 237.
[28] Elder to Pont, January 2, 1862, VII, 283.
[29] Elder to Odin, 1862, VII, 319.
[30] *Metropolitan Catholic Almanac and Laity's Directory, for the United States, Canada and the British Provinces for 1861* (Baltimore, 1861), p. 118.

of Richmond could not furnish a chaplain he would make arrangements to send one of his priests.[31] Continual reports of the lack of priests among the troops caused Elder to take counsel with the Bishop of Mobile.

> My conscience has been uneasy lately about our Soldiers. In December I wrote as I promised to Bishop McGill to make some inquiries about Chaplains. From his answer I concluded that a Chaplain would have little to do because he told me the Soldier's had no care to make use of his services. Consequently I took no further steps. But after all it seems to me, that the soldiers of our respective Dioceses being an important part of our flocks we ought to follow them with our solicitude & make at least some reasonable exertions to bring them to the practice of their religion. Are we obliged to wait till they ask for Chaplains? Is it not better for us to enquire into their needs, if they are indifferent that very indifference is a thing that ought to awake our compassion & call forth our exertions to remove it. It is frightful to read some of the letters from camp & see how wickedness, godlessness & immorality must be prevailing. Besides the number of souls lost in battle & sickness what will be the situation of the country after the war if the great body of our young men come home hardened & demoralized?[32]

For these reasons, the bishop continued, he was inclined to sacrifice some of the blessings of religion on the home front for the sake of the soldiers.

The fact that the Catholic bishops were waiting for specific calls from the army for chaplains appeared to Elder to be a weakness. "Is it not our place as Pastors to *follow* our flocks with our solicitude, to enquire into their wants, & to seek means to relieve them?" he asked the Archbishop of New Orleans.[33] He voiced the same thought to the Bishop of Charleston when he queried "ought not we ourselves to take measures to get commissions" as chaplains for the needed priests? "And is it not better to let congregations at home have only half their usual attendance—than to let so many hundreds of young men live & die in such exposure of their souls without help?"[34]

The statement of John McGill, Bishop of Richmond, that the chaplains would find little to do not only puzzled but very naturally worried Elder. From the fact that two of his priests at Columbus,

[31] Elder to John E. Elliott, December 10, 1861, VII, 237.
[32] Elder to Quinlan, February 26, 1862, VII, 326.
[33] Elder to Odin, 1862, VII, 319. [34] Elder to Lynch, March 1, 1862, VII, 340.

Mississippi, found themselves continually occupied, he concluded that the difference was in the conduct of the chaplains. "If the Priest waited to be called for," he told Bishop Lynch, "indifference & human respect will keep the men away. But if he be a zealous shepherd he will look on this indifference as the very matter to be remedied & he will be diligent in going about to hunt up Catholics & bring them to their duty & thus he will have work enough."[35] Elder's own experience in visiting the hospitals, as he remarked to the Bishop of Richmond, was that when he spoke to the individual soldiers of confession, "some would express at once their willingness or even desire to make it. Others would make some faint excuses for a little while but almost invariably they would yield to a few words of advice."[36]

To Bishop Elder the nomination of chaplains by the officers and their appointment by the central government seemed unfair for, as he said, "perhaps not one man in fifty believed in his teachings or cared for his prayers—& not a few of them found his service a burden to their consciences."[37] It seemed to the bishop that it would be more in accord with American republican institutions "if the appointing of Chaplains & the number & choice of the individuals were made dependent on the *voluntary* system with the government doing something for their encouragement."[38] In a letter to the Bishop of Charleston he outlined his plan.

> Let Government assign a certain portion which [it] would pay to the Chaplain—say one half or one fourth of what he should reasonably expect & let the men if they choose make up the complement for one agreeable to themselves. If they have not religion enough to do this—the govt. will be saved the expense of providing religious service which is not wanted by those interested. . . . It is a novelty but that is no objection. All progress is novelty. If inconveniences are anticipated a little foresight followed by a little experience will easily devise arrangements & regulations which will remedy affairs.[39]

---

[35] *Ibid.*

[36] Elder to McGill, August 4, 1862, VIII, 10.

[37] Elder to Lynch, May 9, 1861, Archives of the Diocese of Charleston, Envelope 126.

[38] Elder to Perché, May 9, 1861, VII, 211.

[39] Elder to Lynch, May 9, 1861, Archives of the Diocese of Charleston, Envelope 126.

The supplying of food and clothing to the men and the paying of salaries to the officers was an inconvenience to the government, he continued, but it was the duty of the government to take pains and put itself to inconvenience for the welfare of those under its care. Any objection that his system would involve additional expense to the government, Elder felt, should have no weight. As he told Bishop Lynch, "Men who give themselves wholly to the defence of their country—& are willing to give a portion of their pay—the price of their blood—to obtain the helps of religion—are certainly entitled to have their wants supplied."[40] Despite Elder's enthusiasm, however, nothing came of his plan.

The need for a systematic method of raising troops and holding them led President Davis to recommend to the Confederate Congress in 1862 the passage of the first national law in American history providing for the conscription of troops. After the passage of the act, amendments to it were proposed at every session of the Congress. The Bishop of Natchez with his dwindling supply of priests was particularly fearful that a draft law applying indiscriminately to all men of the Confederacy would be passed. With this as a possibility, he felt that there should be an interchange of ideas as to the proper course to be pursued so that the bishops of the South would show some unanimity of sentiment and uniformity of action. He did not believe, as he told the Bishop of Richmond, that there was room to question that it would be "positively sinful for any Priest actually to engage in the soldier's life; & it seems to me that no grave reason like compulsion, imprisonment, or other punishment would be a sufficient [reason to] justify him in entering on it." If some officials were allowed discretionary power to exempt or to detail some of the clergy who were needed at home for ministerial duty, would it be right, he asked, "for a Bishop or Priest to make application for such exemption or detail?" Elder was of the opinion that if the exemption was granted at the discretion of an officer in the nature of a gratuitous favor, then the bishops should not allow applications to be made by the priests and such should be forbidden by ecclesiastical censure if necessary.[41]

Bishop Elder's fears concerning the conscription of priests were never realized, for the capture of New Orleans by the Federals in

[40] *Ibid.*

[41] Elder to McGill, September 25, 1862, VIII, 94.

1862 gave the Union navy access to the Mississippi River and made the occupation of Natchez by the enemy inevitable. The shelling of Natchez on September 2, 1862, brought the war to the bishop's very doorstep, and with it there arose the question of the oath of allegiance which the Yankees demanded of those who came under their control. Concerned not only for himself but also for his clergy and his people, Elder sought the advice of the Bishop of Mobile because, as he said, "if possible we ought to try to act uniformly whatever one does will be censured if another acts differently." He stated his views in considerable detail for Quinlan:

It is not at all impossible that the Federals may take possession of Natchez this winter, & may demand an oath of allegiance. My opinion is that whoever takes it is bound by conscience to observe it. He cannot claim absolution from it under the Confederate govt. because the very import of the oath is to exclude the Confederate govt. unless it be otherwise explained. But how long is it binding? Does it cease, if the Federalists are driven away from the place? It seems to me that unless otherwise explained, it continues in force until released by the consent of the Federal Govt. which will only be given I suppose on making peace. Otherwise it is nothing but an agreement to submit for the present.

Regarded in its rigorous sense is it lawful for a citizen to take it to save his property & his family? Had we better leave it to each one to judge for himself—weighing his own circumstances?

But then for the Clergy: shall they be left to follow their own judgment or ought I to lay down a rule, & forbid them to violate it under censure? And ought a Bishop himself to take it under any circumstances? My opinion inclines to the negative, notwithstanding Genl. Butler's reasoning, that all who are not with the Federal govt. are against it, & are to be treated as enemies—it seems to me that the very fact of their recognizing our soldiers as belligerents, giving titles to our Generals & exchanging prisoners—is a confession that the Conf[d] govt. whether lawful or unlawful in their eyes, has sufficient authority to justify its citizens in their conscience for adhering to it & consequently refusing to renounce it & a man, whose character & position make him a non-combatant, is entitled to be unmolested. Such is the case with the Catholic clergy; & it seems to me that a Bishop ought to stand upon this ground. Whether he yields or refuses there is danger of injury to religion: but I think that in refusing he maintains the right & throws the odium upon those who chose to violate it.[42]

[42] Elder to Quinlan, November 17, 1862, VIII, 161. General Benjamin F. Butler (1818-1893) was the ranking Union commander in the area.

The Federal occupation of Natchez in July, 1863, brought about the most uncomfortable incident in the long life of Bishop Elder. At the cathedral during his episcopacy prayers had occasionally been recited for the public authorities, both ecclesiastical and civil, first of the United States and at a later date of the Confederacy. As the bishop informed President Lincoln in November, 1862, he had "laid aside all these prayers of a local character, & conformed more closely to the approved usages of the Church, by adopting a prayer belonging to the authorized Liturgy, the Litany of the Saints."[43] Sometime in the early part of 1864, Brigadier General James M. Tuttle, the Federal commander of Natchez, orally directed the bishop, as he told Lincoln, "to read, or to direct the Priests under my jurisdiction to read, in the Public Services of the Cathedral Church of Natchez, a certain Prayer, which is found in some Catholic prayer books, for the Public Authorities." Failure to do so, Tuttle had declared, would be "a proof of disloyalty, which would be subject to punishment."[44] Nothing daunted, Elder protested directly to President Lincoln at this attempt to interfere with his ecclesiastical administration. The bishop sent his letter to the Reverend John Early, S.J., of Georgetown College in Washington, who passed it on to Francis Kernan of Syracuse, New York, a member of the House of Representatives, who, in turn, took it on April 27, 1864, to Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton. That same day the assistant adjutant general, Edward R. S. Canby, sent a directive to General Tuttle in which it was stated "you will not proscribe any form of prayer or of service or in any other way interfere in matters of Church administration except in cases of disloyalty when you will report the facts to this Department and take its orders."[45]

Thus matters rested until June when Tuttle departed taking with him the letter of reprimand. The new commander, Colonel Bernard C. Farrar, on June 18 in Special Orders Number Thirty-One noted that the pastors of many churches neglected to make any public recognition of allegiance to the government and that regular or customary prayers for the President of the United States and all others

[43] Elder to Lincoln, April 7, 1864, Archives of the Diocese of Natchez-Jackson (photostat of original in the National Archives).

[44] *Ibid.*

[45] Gerow, *op. cit.*, p. 167. The correspondence covering this case is published here, pp. 161-184.

in authority had been omitted from the church services. As a consequence he ordered:

> that hereafter, the ministers of such churches as may have the prescribed form of prayers for the President of the United States shall be read at each and every service in which it is required by the rubrics—and that those of other denominations which have no such form—shall on like occasions pronounce a prayer appropriate to the time and expressive of a proper spirit toward the chief magistrate of the U. S.[46]

Any minister who failed to comply was to be prohibited from exercising his office in Natchez and he would render himself liable, at the discretion of the commandant, to banishment beyond the lines of the Federal forces.

Bishop Elder, absent from Natchez at the time the order was issued, prepared upon his return a lengthy letter in which he declined to comply with the demand, at the same time setting forth in detail the reasons for his action.[47] Meanwhile another change of commanding officers had occurred. The new commandant, Brigadier General Mason Brayman, despite interviews with Elder and an exchange of letters, continued to be of the opinion that military orders were to be obeyed, not discussed. On July 19, therefore, Elder appealed to Secretary Stanton to settle the question once and for all by "sending instructions which may be recorded for the guidance of the present & future Commanders."[48]

Three days later General Brayman issued Special Orders Number Eleven which, after stating that the Bishop of Natchez was "still in rebellion against the United States, and ill disposed towards the government thereof" because of his refusal to comply with the previous special orders, directed that Elder be expelled from the lines, "not to return without permission, on pain of imprisonment during the continuance of the rebellion." In addition, the provost marshall was to close and take military possession of St. Mary's Cathedral and all other houses and places of worship within Elder's jurisdiction in which the prayers for the president had once been but were not then being read. Inasmuch as Elder had requested suspension of action under this order until communications could be had with Washington, Brayman held up the action called for until further orders. The

[46] *Ibid.*, pp. 167-168.
[47] New York *Freeman's Journal*, September 10, 1864.
[48] Gerow, *op. cit.*, pp. 172-176.

general, nonetheless, displayed his authority to the extent of directing that Elder report within twenty-four hours after receiving a copy of the order "to the Officer commanding the U. S. Forces at Vidalia [Louisiana] and remain within his military lines under penalty of the immediate execution of the before named orders."[49]

Clearly the only course open to Bishop Elder was compliance. At Vidalia, despite rumors to the contrary, he was not in close confinement, but had all personal freedom within the Federal lines. For the first few days he stayed "at the village hotel, and afterwards in a private family."[50] No sooner was the bishop established at Vidalia than he proceeded to communicate again with Stanton. A Washington friend wrote Elder on August 8 that the commanding officer of the Department of the Mississippi had been ordered to forbid his subordinate to interfere with the rights of the Catholics.[51]

Suddenly, on August 12 General Brayman ordered the release of the bishop. The language of the special order reveals so much of the commander himself that it warrants quotation. Brayman wrote:

> Military Authority having been for the time, vindicated, so much of Special Order No. 11, as requires Rev. William Henry Elder, Bishop of Natchez, to remain within the Military lines of the Post of Vidalia, La., is suspended and he may return to his home and duties, until the pleasure of the War Department be known, in his case.
>
> And as all solemn appeals to the Supreme Being, not proceeding from honest hearts, and willing minds, are necessarily offensive to Him, and subversive of sound morality, so much of Special Order No. 31, June 18, 1864, as requires public prayer to be pronounced, in behalf of the President of the United States, and the Union, is suspended until further orders; leaving all persons conducting Divine Worship, at liberty to manifest such measure of hostility, as they may feel, against the Government and Union of these States, and their sympathy with the rebellion, by omitting such supplication, if so minded.[52]

To Elder's mind Brayman had expected the order to be revoked at Washington, "& that sending me to Vidalia was for the purpose of

[49] Broadside, Archives of the Diocese of Natchez-Jackson. It was widely copied by the newspapers; cf. New York *Freeman's Journal*, August 20, 1864.

[50] *Ibid.*, October 29, 1864.

[51] Gerow, *op. cit.*, pp. 179-180.

[52] Broadside, Archives of the Diocese of Natchez-Jackson. This order was also widely copied by the newspapers; cf. Columbus, Georgia, *Daily Sun*, September 10, 1864.

not letting one refusal pass without some penalty in vindication of his claim to be obeyed."[53]

The arrest of Bishop Elder aroused a great deal of intemperate language among the newspapers and no rumor was too wild to find its way into print.[54] In fact, so numerous did the supposed authentic accounts of the treatment accorded the prelate become that the Vicar General of the Diocese of Natchez, Mathwin F. Grignon, at Elder's request, wrote a public letter for the press in which he corrected some of the misconceptions.[55] The *Pacificator,* a Catholic weekly published at Augusta, Georgia, had the last word in the controversy with a play upon the general's surname.

> The order with a long preamble came from a General Bray-man and never did a man exhibit more of the qualities of the braying animal, than is found in this order. The case was referred to the authorities at Washington, who seem to have discovered that Brayman brayed too loudly on that occasion.[56]

Throughout the crisis of secession and war, when he was not subjected to enemy control, Bishop Elder recognized that the government of Mississippi and of the Confederate States were the *de facto* governments and the ones to which he and his fellow citizens owed their allegiance and support. With the problems occasioned by the blockade and the consequent shortages, he manfully wrestled although forced to utilize improvisations. For the men in military service he maintained an unflagging concern and nobly tried to supply them with chaplains. When Natchez was occupied by the Federal army Bishop Elder without hesitation professed obedience to the Union, but he stoutly and successfully resisted all attempts by commanders to interfere with his ecclesiastical administration. A true son of the Church, William Henry Elder served it to the utmost of his ability. At the same time he displayed a high sense of partiotism and civic responsibility during the crisis that overtook his divided country.

Georgia Institute of Technology

[53] Gerow, *op. cit.,* p. 182.

[54] Cf., e.g., New York *Freeman's Journal,* September 24, 1864, Columbus, Georgia, *Daily Columbus Enquirer,* September 1, 1864.

[55] New York *Freeman's Journal,* October 29, 1864.

[56] October 8, 1864.

MISCELLANY

A LETTER OF BISHOP FLAGET TO HENRY CLAY

EDITED BY
THOMAS WHITAKER*

The careers of Benedict Joseph Flaget (1763-1850) and Henry Clay (1777-1852) are so well known that no lengthy account need be given here. Suffice it to say that these two outstanding men, among many in Kentucky at that time, labored in complete agreement for the betterment and cultural advancement of their fellow citizens. The French-born prelate freely adopted the United States as his homeland, and the zeal of his labors was "sensibly felt not only in Kentucky, but in all the Western country." The statesman had come to Kentucky in early manhood as a lawyer, and upon entering politics subsequently served as a member of the state legislature, in both houses of Congress, as a candidate for the presidency, and as Secretary of State under President John Quincy Adams from 1825 to 1829.

As far as can be ascertained, the first personal meeting between Bishop Flaget and Clay took place in July, 1825. The occasion was the commencement exercises of the students at the motherhouse of the Sisters of Charity at Nazareth near Bardstown. It appears likely that the bishop took Clay on a tour of his educational institutions in the vicinity. A mutual interest and concern for cultural advancement was calculated to create a strong bond of friendship between the two men. Two letters of Flaget to Clay, dated September 21, 1825, and April 9, 1832, are among the Clay Papers in the Library of Congress and have already been edited by Bernard Mayo for this REVIEW.[1] Recently another letter in the series, dated April 19, 1827, came to light as a marker in a book donated to the library at St. Maur's Priory, South Union, Kentucky.

The three letters relate the sincere love and zeal which Bishop Flaget had for his adopted country, and show how he endeavored to enrich the culture of the people. In the letter of September 21,

* Brother Thomas, O.S.B., is librarian of St. Maur's Priory, South Union, Kentucky.

[1] XXVII (July, 1941), 210-213.

1825, the bishop informed Clay that his former plans to visit Europe could not be carried out, and also of his determination to do so the following year.[2] However, conditions had not changed, and once more he had to forego his trip abroad. In his stead, he sent the Reverend Bertrand Martial[3] upon whom he bestowed the title of vicar general, entrusting him "to do for my diocese all the good that it will be in his power to accomplish."[4] Father Martial sailed for Havre on June 1, 1826, in company with Bishop Louis W. V. Dubourg and Father Robert A. Abell.[5] Before going to Rome to

[2] Martin John Spalding, *Sketches of the Life, Times, and Character of the Rt. Rev. Benedict Joseph Flaget First Bishop of Louisville* (Louisville, 1852), pp. 307 f. Flaget had a strong sense of obedience to the Holy See to which he wrote asking permission to make this trip. His coadjutor, Bishop John B. David, also wrote requesting that the permission be denied, and Rome followed his advice. It appears that the coadjutor's reluctance to assume the responsibilities for the diocese was the principal reason for his objecting to the trip. It was to be nine years before Bishop Flaget was able to make the long desired visit to Europe.

[3] Father Bertrand Martial, a native of Bourdeaux, France, came to New Orleans in 1818 in company with Mother Philippine Duchesne and the first group of Religious of the Society of the Sacred Heart. It was his intention to open a school for boys in the upper part of the diocese, but at the insistence of Bishop Dubourg, he did so in New Orleans. In addition to his teaching, he did much to improve the troublesome conditions then prevailing among the Catholics of that city. His school was closed in 1824 as the Ursuline Sisters needed the location for a new convent. Martial then brought twenty boys to Bardstown where they enrolled in St. Joseph's College, and he joined the faculty of the college. The following year he returned to New Orleans where he recruited another contingent of fifty-four students for St. Joseph's. It speaks well for the character of Father Martial that after a space of only two years Bishop Flaget should entrust to him a European mission with the title of vicar general. Bishop Dubourg also highly esteemed Martial and at one time submitted his name to the Propaganda as an alternative prospect for his coadjutor. It is not known precisely when Martial returned to Louisiana, but it was within two years after his European trip, for he was in New Orleans at the time of the consecration of Bishop Leo De Neckere, C.M., in 1830. Cf. Spalding, *Flaget . . .*, pp. 283 f. Martial died in the chaplain's house of the Ursuline Convent on July 31, 1832, at the age of sixty-two. Cf. Roger Baudier, *The Catholic Church in Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1939), *passim*. Flaget writing to Bishop Francis P. Kenrick said: "You have heard that dear M. Martial died. You know how generous he was to me. Please, I beg of you, offer the Holy Mass for him. The College paid him every year a salary of $300. At his death, this salary ceases." Archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, 32-A-B-5, Flaget to Kenrick, September 4, 1832.

[4] *Ibid.*, 16-U-18, Flaget to Maréchal, April 18, 1826.

[5] Archives of the Archdiocese of St. Louis, Dubourg to Rosati, May 31, 1826. Dubourg was on his way to Rome to resign the See of New Orleans, although

present Flaget's report on his diocese, Martial spent some time in France during which he contacted the princesses of the House of Orleans.[6] He reached Rome early in 1827 as we learn from a letter of Flaget to Bishop Joseph Rosati of St. Louis.[7] There is no evidence as to when Martial visited the King of Naples, whether while on his way to Rome or after the completion of his business in the Eternal City. Most likely, it was at the latter time since Flaget made no mention of it in the above letter. Father Martial returned from Europe during the spring or summer of 1828.[8]

In the letter of April 19, 1827, Bishop Flaget sought Clay's assistance to have the payment of duties waived on gifts being sent for the adornment of his cathedral. The main significance of the letter lies in the fact that it named specific gifts from the King of Naples, gifts that have been traditionally considered as presentations of Louis Philippe, Duke of Orleans and later King of the French. It is not the editor's intention to enter into the question of the identity of the donor here, but merely to present the letter with some explanation of various points mentioned.

St. Maur's Priory

+

To his Excellency Henry Clay the Secretary of State

Dear Sir

Once more I come to trespass on your patience & your time. Just now I receive a letter from a friend of mine whom I sent last year to Italy with letters of introduction to the various courts of that

---

no one, not even his coadjutor, Bishop Rosati, knew of his intention at the time. It has been said that Abell made the trip as Flaget thought a sojourn in France might polish his oratorical ability. Hereafter these archives are designated as AASt.L.

[6] Archives of the University of Notre Dame, David to Bruté, November 13, 1826; hereafter designated as AUND. This letter also mentions the endeavors of Martial to obtain books.

[7] AASt.L, Flaget to Rosati, February 21, 1827.

[8] AUND, two letters of David to Simon Gabriel Bruté contain this information. The first, dated April 8, 1828, tells of the plans of Fathers Martial and Abell to return that spring. The other, dated October 4, 1828, states that Martial was back in Kentucky. Abell returned in late May or early June, but no mention is made of Martial returning with him. Cf. Spalding, *Flaget . . .*, p. 262.

country.—He informs me he has been well received by all these Princes & that valuable presents to adorn my cathedral shall be sent to me. The King of Naples[9] in particular has promised to forward me a magnificent tabernacle with five large candlesticks[10] the whole of brass sumptuously gilt, & executed by the best Artists in his Kingdom. He speaks also to send fine paintings[11] & many other vestments & ornaments for divine service.—if the duties are to be paid for all these valuable articles which are not and cannot be objects of commerce, I will be under the painful necessity to send them back to my princely benefactor; because at this moment, on account of a large building added to our college[12] we have exhausted all our

[9] The King of Naples, or more properly speaking, the King of the Two Sicilies, was Francis I who reigned from 1825 to 1830. The first Bourbon King of Naples was Charls III of Spain who, upon ascending the latter throne, resigned the Kingdom of Naples to his son, Ferdinand I. The Napoleonic wars caused Ferdinand to flee to Sicily until peace came in 1815 whereupon he regained Naples, taking "the title of Ferdinand I, King of the Two Sicilies." He was succeeded by his son, Francis I, in 1825.

[10] Heretofore, the tabernacle and candlesticks were considered as having been gifts of Louis Philippe, Duke of Orleans and after 1830 King of the French. Martin John Spalding: *Sketches of the Early Catholic Missions of Kentucky . . .* (Louisville, 1844), p. 246, states that they were removed to Louisville when the see was transferred to that city. The tabernacle was in use in the cathedral for many years before being removed by Bishop Peter J. Lavialle. Eventually, after being in use at St. Augustine's Church and at the Convent of the Sisters of Mercy, it was taken to the old cathedral at Bardstown where it may still be seen. Cf. "Recollections of a Tabernacle," by John A. Doyle in an unnamed newspaper clipping on file in the Archives of the Motherhouse of the Sisters of Charity at Nazareth. The candlesticks are still in use on the high altar of the cathedral in Louisville.

[11] The paintings in the old cathedral ata Bardstown, too, have been traditionally considered as gifts from Louis Philippe. He did send some paintings, although several of those in the old cathedral at present bear the Latin inscription *"Ex dono Franciscus I Utriusque Sicilae Rex."* Three of these are traditionally considered as being the work of Van Dyck: St. John the Baptist, St. Peter in Chains, and the Winged St. Mark. Father Louis Deppen writing in the *Record* of October 31, 1901, stated that the painting of St. Charles Borromeo given by the King of Naples was taken to Louisville by Flaget at the time of the transfer of the see.

[12] St. Joseph's College at Bardstown. Beginning in 1823 and for several years thereafter considerable building was being done there. Cf. B. J. Webb, *The Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky* (Louisville, 1884), p. 278. In all likelihood, the building referred to by Flaget was necessitated by the large influx of students brought from New Orleans by Martial.

founds [*sic*] & we are involved in debts, & will be so for nearly two years. I know that Congress alone who has enacted the law can dispense of it. But when the intention of Congress is manifested by the grant of privilege of the same nature & in behalf of the same individual who now sollicits—[13]

Has not the President the power of interpreting the law according to the precedent already established by Congress itself?—His Excellency the minister of the King of Naples is to write you upon the same subject. For God's sake, give me another proof of your generous friendship, & in favour of a town where, I have been told, you have been partly trained up.—[14] My zeal for the country which I have freely & deliberately adopted is unrelenting; & thanks be to God the good effects of it are sensibly felt not only in Kentucky, but in all the Western country— The same friend I sent into Italy tells also that most probably he will bring along with him a Botanist & a Pharmacian [*sic*] of the first rate abilities, & also an excellent Drawing master.[15] These two learned men, if they come, will be a great acquisition for the country, & will render important services to the community at large.—All these considerations, I trust in God, will make an impression upon our worthy President, & you on your side you will do your best, I am sure, in order to encourage my constant & arduous exertions for the good of Kentucky— Be so good,

[13] Here Flaget alludes to the bill passed on May 20, 1826, remitting duties paid on gifts from the Duke and Duchess of Orleans in 1824. Cf. *Congressional Record*, 19th Congress, 1826, p. 346. The *United States Catholic Miscellany* of June 2, 1824, carried an item concerning these gifts in which mention was made of the donors. Early in 1825 Flaget thanked Bruté for the books and apparatus for the college obtained by the latter on his recent trip to France. Although he had not unpacked the boxes, he hoped that they contained the gifts obtained from Louis Philippe by Father Stephen T. Badin, AUND, Flaget to Bruté, January 3, 1825.

[14] It is difficult to ascertain how Bishop Flaget got the impression that Clay had studied at Bardstown. All sources consulted indicated that Clay received his training in the law offices of Robert Brooke, Esquire, in Richmond, Virginia. In November, 1797, he left Richmond with a license to practice law issued by the judges of Virginia. Upon arriving at Lexington, Kentucky, he spent several months at his legal studies before embarking upon his career as a lawyer. It is conjectural that he made these studies under one of several eminent Lexington barristers who later moved to Bardstown.

[15] The sources consulted do not reveal whether these men came to Bardstown when Martial returned from Europe.

if you please, to inform me by your secretary what I have to fear or to hope in the present circumstance, & with all the sentiments of my sincere gratitude & cordial affection I remain

of your Excellency
the most obedt & Devoted Servt & friend
✠ BENEDICT JOSEPH FLAGET Bishop of Bardstown
April 19th 1827

BOOK REVIEWS

GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

Histoire Universelle des Missions Catholiques. Volume I, *Les Missions des Origines au XVI^e Siècle;* Volume II, *Les Missiones Modernes (XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles).* Edited by Simon Delacroix. (Paris: Librairie Grund. 1956, 1957. Pp. 365; 421. 4,000 francs each bound volume.)

The two volumes under review are the first of four volumes of a new and excellently planned Catholic mission history. It is a work of collaboration of some twenty specialists under the general direction of Monsignor Simon Delacroix of the Institut Catholique in Paris. But it is a work of exposition rather than research, and is written for the benefit of all classes of serious readers, if not for the specialist and scholar. Volume I covers Catholic mission history from the foundation of the Church through the beginning of the modern mission in the era of the age of discovery. Volume II carries the story through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to the period of the decline of the missions, characterized as this was by the passing of the Ibero-Catholic colonial predominance and the rise of the English-Dutch Protestant imperialism. Volumes III and IV will cover the remaining centuries of Catholic mission effort, and both are scheduled to appear before the beginning of 1959.

These first two volumes easily establish the work as a landmark in Catholic missiography. In fact, this work can be said to represent the fruition of a half century of increasingly impressive scholarship in this field. As a modern synthesis this work outdates all other contributions and can be expected to become the standard guide. Specialists like Daniélou, Dvornik, Daniel-Rops, Robert Ricard, and Henri Bernard-Maitre write some thirty chapters in which 1,500 years of mission history are surveyed. Their names give some idea of the quality of history that awaits the reader. It would be difficult to conceive of a work of greater scope, more neatly balanced and scientifically written, and more beautifully produced. It is hoped there will be an English translation and, of course, a reproduction of the many excellent plates despite the cost.

This universal Catholic mission history is also a mission geography. There is an abundance of elegant illustrations, including portraits of mission scenes and episodes and of mission personalities and foreign personages. There are many contemporary cuts and engravings, drawings and plans of buildings, layouts of harbors and fortifications, pictures of items of foreign culture along with many maps in sketch and color, rare con-

temporary reproductions which give one a sense of the times. There is as much to see as to read in this mission history. The more than 100 plates give us many times that number of illustrations; of the 740 pages of text in the two volumes no less than 160 are devoted to these illustrations. The work qualifies as a kind of encyclopedia of Catholic missions.

Kenneth Scott Latourette of Yale, who has done for the general history of Christian missions what this work does for Catholic missions, as long ago as 1936 observed at the annual meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association that mission history was generally neglected by historians. A similar complaint was voiced in 1948 by the reviewer of Volume XVII of the Fliche-Martin history of the Church who found that in a book of 500 pages, supposedly devoted to the complete history of the Church in the modern epoch, only thirty pages were devoted to the greatest period of Catholic missionary expansion. Such deficient recognition of mission history is doubtless due to the fact that no such work as the present synthesis was available. Especially within the last two decades, the advance of Catholic historical scholarship in general has produced the necessary monographic literature to make this synthesis possible. This is not to say that these volumes represent a definitive synthesis. Rather such a work as this makes more obvious certain gaps in mission history research which is particularly true of Ibero-America which still lacks, e.g., studies of mission method and of influential factors on the missions like the royal patronage and the royal vicariate of the Indies.

The first volume of this work devotes half of its 346 pages of text to the familiar material covered in ancient and mediaeval mission history, most of which is customarily integrated with standard accounts of the growth of the Church in the centuries before the expansion of Europe. However, these chapters pay particular note to the history of method and thus contribute to a fuller appreciation of missionary problems. There are also accounts of certain neglected phases of mission history like the spread of the faith among the Slavic peoples and the missionary ideas of the mendicant orders. The third part of Volume I deals with the beginning of the modern mission of the Church in the age of discovery where accounts of Spanish and Portuguese missionary expansion in America will give the reader new insights into a story too often told in unimaginative standard phrases. Robert Ricard of Mexican mission history fame is the author, and the only criticism one could make of his accounts are that the editors did not allow him more space (forty-five pages). With these beginnings of mission effort in the Americas are also those in Africa and the Far East. The position and contribution of St. Francis Xavier is critically examined and evaluated. A lengthy study of the "Christian Century in Japan," based on C. R. Boxer's excellent book of that title,

is made by Father Bernard Maitre, S.J., who also contributes other chapters of high quality on Oriental mission history.

Volume II with its 394 pages of text makes more of a contribution to the field than does its companion. Here we have chapters built around the great mission personalities of Ricci, Rhodes, and Nobili and France's entrance into the mission field with the roles Richilieu and Père Joseph played depicted. But the several chapters on the foundation, development, and activity of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide and its mortal struggle with the patronage are, perhaps, the most significant contribution of this volume. While no mission history ever fails to mention the importance of Propaganda, its decisive role in the modernization of the missionary effort of the Church is seldom put in the proper perspective. This role and this struggle has best been portrayed in the two-volume work of Monsignor Henri Chappoulie, *Aux Origines d'Une Eglise: Rome et les Missions d'Indochine au XVII^e Siècle* (Paris, 1943, 1948), but it has never been developed in a general account of the missions as in the case of the present work. How Propaganda displaced the royal patronage and how Rome's vicars apostolic replaced the king's *vicariato regio de las Indias* is here told in considerable detail and with it the history of the modernization of the missionary concept of the Church. The question of rites, which incidentally is expertly discussed, no longer monopolizes Oriental mission history. Rather modern re-interpretation of the role of Propaganda has stressed all the aspects of the principle of indigenization of the Church so clearly outlined by the first secretary of Propaganda, Monsignor Francesco Ingoli, in his penetrating criticism of the usurpations of the patronage and the Europeanization of mission work. The significance of this same principle in nineteenth-century mission history, especially as regards the creation of native clergy and hierarchy, will doubtless be treated in the third volume, as intimated by Celso Cardinal Costantini, in his revealing preface.

The critical reader of these two volumes may be disappointed in not finding clusters of footnotes; but he should remember that though the collaborators are all scholars, they are not writing for other scholars but for a much wider and more important audience. Each chapter will be found to have an excellently selected list of references and an up-to-date bibliography. Indices to help one through such a complicated work will most certainly be found in the last volume. With no exaggeration it can be said that Catholic mission history and geography have never been more completely or attractively presented than in this brilliant synthesis of the divine and human story of "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations."

WILLIAM J. COLEMAN

Maryknoll Seminary

The Canons of the Council of Sardica, A.D. 343. By Hamilton Hess. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1958. Pp. viii, 170. $4.00.)

In this volume Dr. Hess offers a careful study of the significant Council of Sardica which he correctly terms, in the sub-title of his book, "a landmark in the early development of canon law." He is principally concerned with the background of the assembly and with the Sardican canons themselves and does not attempt to trace in detail the subsequent history or influence of this legislation. The book consists of two series of studies, the first historical and textual, the second interpretative of the canons issued by the council. It is supplemented by tables and bibliography and by three appendices: on the date of the council, which the author is satisfied was in the autumn of 343; on the origin of the canons of Antioch; and on the place of the canons of Sardica in the early Latin canonical collections. After a brief historical summary of the background and preliminaries of the council, together with some treatment of its leading figure, Hosius of Cordova, Dr. Hess discusses some of the problems connected with the Sardican canons. He first refers to the evidence for their genuineness and then considers at greater length the form of the canons and the question of textual priority. With regard to the form of the canons, they appear only as synodical minutes or as a verbal process, not as statutes or canonical resolutions; Dr. Hess suggests that no explanation for this can be established other than simple neglect to reduce the minutes to the more usual form. In the other question, he follows the hypothesis of a double redaction, in which priority belongs to neither Greek nor Latin version: the Latin being the language of the council, the Greek being either minutes of the Latin debate taken down at the time by a bilingual scribe or a record of the translation of the Latin proposals made by an interpreter for the benefit of the Greek-speaking bishops.

The first half of the book is concluded with an interesting account of the transmission of the texts. The author then goes on to an interpretation of the canons, which he groups under four headings: translation of bishops and other clergy; appointment of bishops; appeal canons; episcopal visits to the imperial court. The consideration is necessarily brief, but Dr. Hess deals effectively with the circumstances leading up to the several laws, and indicates very well, e.g., the administrative or organizational differences between East and West which clarify some of the canons.

Throughout the studies in interpretation, the author's reasons and arguments are clearly and logically stated. It is to be regretted, however, that he occasionally dismisses a contrary opinion too lightly (e.g., in the case of E. Caspar, p. 125) and that he is not able to develop his own position at greater length. The latter is true in the case of the appeal canons so long controverted. In this matter of appeal to Rome, too, Dr.

Hess employs at times an unfortunate choice of words, "interference" from Rome where "intervention" would have served his meaning, or "concession" of powers to the Roman pontiff where he assumes almost casually what might be the subject of much discussion. In general, his attitude toward the Roman primacy may be described as minimizing, at least in its tone.

FREDERICK R. MCMANUS

The Catholic University of America

Saint Bernard of Clairvaux. By Bruno S. James. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1957. Pp. 192. $2.75.)

Father James does not intend this "essay in biography," as its sub-title states, to replace the works of Vacandard and Watkin Williams, but rather to supplement them. He acknowledges his indebtedness to these authors as well as to the Trappist Historical Commission. He has produced an excellent distillation of Bernard's letters which Father James recently translated [Cf. REVIEW, XL (April, 1954), 66-68]. Providing the minimum of historical background necessary for the proper context, he has woven these selections into a stimulating character study, in which he allows Bernard to speak for himself. The author's object is "to keep the figure of Bernard before my eyes and clear away all the matted undergrowth of irrelevant detail and legend. . . ." This he has neatly achieved in 192 pages. In every important facet of Bernard's life—enthusiasm for his vocation, maturing guidance of the monks under his care, monastic ideals, attitudes in the quarrels between the nascent Cistercian Order and the older Black Monks, opposition to the "new theology" of Peter Abelard, outspoken fearlessness in counseling or rebuking abbots and bishops, counts and kings, emperors and popes—the saint's personality and convictions are permitted to shine forth through his own vigorous words. The author has also taken special pains to illustrate the lovable and human side of Bernard, his striking capacity for friendship, and his sense of humor. One views the salient affairs of the secular and ecclesiastical world of the twelfth century through Bernard's eyes not as cold dead facts but as vibrant issues fraught with serious consequences for Church and State and for the souls of the great figures of the day.

Father James strives where possible to clarify or justify several aspects of Bernard's activities which have been the object of previous misunderstanding or adverse criticism, e.g., his attack on Abelard or the supposed duplicity of his advice to Pope Innocent II regarding the conflict between King Louis VII and Theobald of Champagne. He does not, however, condone or explain away the saint's human failings or mistaken judg-

ments, but cites them as specific antidotes to the legendary aspects of the "edifying" biographies produced since Bernard's own day. There is hardly any mention made of the miracles for which he was so famous. The final chapter summarizes the author's observations regarding Bernard's physical appearance, temperament, and sanctity.

In keeping with the nature of this study, the footnotes refer principally to letters in the author's edition and to the corresponding letters in Migne. It is clear throughout, however, that Father James is well acquainted with the pertinent literature on Bernard. A select bibliography, an appendix briefly describing Bernard's works, and an adequate index are provided. This biography is to be commended to layman and scholar alike for the deep insight it gives into the soul of the man who dominated the first half of the twelfth century as, perhaps, no other man has ever dominated his age.

RICHARD H. TRAME

Loyola University of Los Angeles

St. Dominic. Pilgrim of Light. By Gerard K. Brady. (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1957. Pp. xvii, 169. $3.95.)

There are few lives of St. Dominic in English. To this extent the present volume is a welcome addition to Dominican bibliography and will contribute to a wider knowledge of the saint. However, it does not supersede the lives by Fathers Bede Jarrett, O.P., or Jerome Wilms, O.P. Mr. Brady's book is well-written. The reader becomes fascinated with it and moves rapidly through its pages. The abundance of material illustrating the contemporary scene is noteworthy and commendable, since it sets up a gauge of Dominic's stature. But the author often buries the saint under this wealth of detail and leaves the reader wondering what has become of him. This is unfortunate. The allotted space could have been better used to focus stronger light on Dominic's character and accomplishments. Source material for this purpose exists and should have been utilized.

The serious student of St. Dominic will find nothing in the book for him. It is a popular and not a scientific study. Furthermore, the author has not taken advantage of all the late research in the saint's life. There are a considerable number of inaccuracies, e.g., in spite of statements in the book, the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa, 1212, was not a naval battle (p. 53); the house of Peter Seila was not outside the walls of Toulouse (p. 95); the house still stands (p. xvii); Seila was in the first company that turned his home into the first Dominican priory (p. 95); there is no evidence that Dominic's father was royal warden of Caleruega or that his mother died in 1202 (p. 22); the Dominicans are living at present in part of St. Nicholas Priory, Bologna (p. 112). A serious error of

interpretation occurs in the chapters that detail the beginning of apostolic preaching in the Narbonnaise in 1206. The initiative was taken entirely by Bishop Diego of Osma. Dominic was his companion and support, but he was not the leader and came to the fore only after Diego died toward the end of 1207. Brady reverses these roles. Also, Diego and Dominic did not come upon a conference of papal legates, abbots, and clergy in 1206 but only a private meeting of the three papal legates (p. 62).

The author falls into a number of errors regarding Dominic's tenure at Palencia and Osma: viz., he had long been a friend of the Bishop of Osma before becoming a canon there, had held a benefice as canon while studying at Palencia, returned to Palencia as a reader of theology, as professor heroically sold his books and befriended the poor (p. 26). None of these statements is true. Dominic practiced his charities as a student. This and his fine reputation at Palencia brought him to the attention of the bishop, who was reforming his cathedral chapter. He never taught theology formally anywhere. The retention of benefices during a sojourn at the schools was not yet common practice, and the cathedral at Osma had made no disposition in favor of scholar-canons. A strict following of Jordan of Saxony (*Libellus de principiis ordinis Praedicatorum*, ed. H. C. Scheeben, *Monumenta ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum historica*, XVI [Rome, 1935], 26-33 no. 4-14) would have prevented these errors. Brady preferred the testimony of Stephen of Spain, given at the canonization process in 1234 (*Acta canonizationis S. Dominici*, ed. A. Walz, *Monumenta O. P. H.*, XVI, 153-154 no. 35). At this point Stephen speaks from hearsay, profoundly confuses his chronology, and blunders into inaccuracy. He cannot stand against Jordan of Saxony.

Despite these strictures there are many pleasing features about the book, and among them are the characterizations of personages that people its pages, and the eleven excellent photographs of scenes and places in the saint's life. The frontispiece is a photograph of the bust of St. Dominic at Bologna modelled on anthropological study of his skull and a description of his features by a contemporary. An index, brief bibliography, and a map are included in the volume.

WILLIAM A. HINNEBUSCH

Dominican House of Studies
Washington

Geschichte des Konzils von Trient. Band II: *Die erste Trienter Tagungsperiode, 1545-47.* By Hubert Jedin. (Freiburg-im-Breisgau: Verlag Herder. 1957. Pp. x, 550.)

In 1949, after ten years of preparation, the first volume of Monsignor Jedin's *History of the Council of Trent* appeared (English translation by

Dom Ernest Graf, Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1957). Magisterially, it depicted the interplay of conciliarism and the desire for church reform during the years subsequent to the Council of Basle (1431-1437), then traced the antecedents of Trent from the first demands for the synod in 1518, through the convocation and rescinding of an assembly at Mantua (1536-1537), to the actual inauguration of the Tridentine sessions on December 13, 1545. In the 1949 preface the author announced his intention of comprising within a single volume the first two convocations at Trent (1545-1547, 1551-1552), together with the Bologna interlude. Circumstances now compel him, however, to limit this second volume to the story of the first convocation, so that it terminates with the translation of the synod to Bologna in March, 1547.

Monsignor Jedin is thoroughly familiar with this first Tridentine period which he has already studied in his *Girolamo Seripando, sein Leben und Denken* (2 vols., Würzburg, 1937; drastically abridged as *Papal Legate at the Council of Trent,* St. Louis, 1947). Four of its eight conciliar sessions, e.g., the fourth session (April 8, 1546) on Scripture and tradition, the fifth (June 17) on original sin, the sixth (January 13, 1547) on justification, and the seventh (March 3) on the sacraments, are of high dogmatic significance. Every theological student knows the decrees from Denziger's *Enchiridion.* But it is a distinct experience to find oneself participating in the general congregation of January 4, 1546, whereat the formula *"universalem ecclesiam representans"* was excluded from the synod's title, to follow the discussions of January 18-22 as to whether dogma or reform should be given priority (settled by the compromise to treat them simultaneously), to sit in upon the meetings of February 12-15 which examined the question of the canon of the Scriptures. How deep feeling ran is revealed in Bishop Martelli of Fiesole's criticism on May 10, 1546, of the privileges of exempt religious orders (p. 93). How great was the need for dogmatic clarification is shown by Seripando's tract on concupiscence (pp. 122-123) and by the two forms (June 7, 14) of the decree on original sin, as well as by the debates which stretched from June 21, 1546, to January 13, 1547, in the course whereof five forms of the decree on justification were submitted to minute examination.

A critic of the first volume saw it as the work of an "unbedingter Papalist." Karl Adam judged it "das Gründlichste und Sachlichste" of published studies on Trent. Both evaluations will be applied to this present installment. Catholic it is, prodigiously learned and scrupulously fair.

HENRY G. J. BECK

Immaculate Conception Seminary
Darlington

The Influence of Erasmus, Witzel, and Cassander in the Church Ordinances and Reform Proposals of the United Duchies of Cleve during the Middle Decades of the 16th Century. By John Patrick Dolan, C.S.C. (Münster: Aschendorf. 1958. Pp. xv, 119, DM. 9:80.)

In order to understand more easily the contents and purpose of this monograph it might be well to give the following preliminaries: 1) The locality: the United Duchies of Cleve. Four different unions took place in this northwestern duchy of Europe known at the time of the Reformation as Cleve-Mark and Jülich-Berg-Ravenberg, viz., those of 1299, 1391, 1423, and 1511 (1521). 2) The *dramatis personnae:* Erasmus, Witzel, Cassander. We are all sufficiently well acquainted with the questionable role played by Erasmus (1466-1535) during the Reformation, but not so well, perhaps, with that of the other two. Witzel (1501-1573) was a disciple of (the then still Catholic) Luther and Melancton at the Universities of Erfurt and Wittenberg; a Catholic priest (1521); a married convert to Protestantism; and a "convert" back to Catholicism. For as Erasmus could not agree with Luther's *De libero arbitrio,* Witzel could not see eye to eye with him in his system of morality. Cassander (1518-1566) was a Catholic lay theologian, counsellor to the Dukes of Cleve, and a friend of Witzel. All three of these German humanists were irenic mediators who sought mostly by compromise to harmonize Catholic doctrines and practices with Protestant viewpoints and thereby effect a union between the two dissenting religions. 3) The topic: a study of the reform decrees in the Duchy of Cleve (1533, 1545-1556, and 1564) emanating from from the secular, albeit Catholic, but ecclesiastically independent dukes, and the influence of the above-named three humanists on the elaboration and promulgation of these church ordinances. 4) The general purpose: to show that whereas Erasmus (as generally believed) might have had some influence on them, especially on the first set of ordinances of 1533, it was Witzel—one of the most learned and prolific writers of his day—who exerted the most influence, and this despite the fact that Cassander stood closer to the dukes as their counsellor. 5) The specific purpose of Father Dolan's work is to show that by sacrificing some of the historic and traditional tenets of Catholic faith, doctrine, and practices such as the veneration of the saints, the use of Latin in the administration of the sacraments, communion of the laity under one species only, private Masses, Mass stipends, clerical celibacy, etc., the way would be paved for a quick return of the Protestant dissenters to the Catholic Church. 6) The means: a return to the ancient liturgical practices of the early Church and the elimination of all subsidiary adjuncts added down the centuries; a greater participation by the laity in the sacred rites (singing; answering of prayers; personal offerings of hosts; yes, even a return to

the public confession of sins); all of which, even if accomplished, would only questionably have brought back the dissenters as later developments showed. The primacy of jurisdiction of Peter above all things was the great stumbling block.

Father Dolan has made an excellent contribution toward a better understanding of the problems which confronted alike the princes, theologians, and people of Germany during the middle of the sixteenth century before Trent had spoken officially and decided definitely for Catholics the problems at issue in the so-called Protestant Reformation. Neoliturgists, too, will find the work an interesting study.

RAPHAEL M. HUBER

St. Anthony-on-Hudson
Rensselaer

The Spiritans: A History of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost. By Henry J. Koren, C.S.Sp. [Duquesne Studies, Spiritan Series, Volume I.] (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press. 1958. Pp. xxix, 641. $6.50).

The story of the Holy Ghost Congregation (Spiritans) began when a millionaire's son and potential playboy, the brilliant Claude Francis Poullart des Places of Brittany, lawyer turned theologian, became concerned with the pitiful lot of Paris chimney-sweeps. His compassion grew to include fellow theologians living poorly and alone. Only twenty-four years old and not yet a priest himself, des Places opened Holy Ghost Seminary in Paris on Pentecost Sunday, 1703, to provide future priests with a decent home and an adequate training. The professors of this seminary became the first Holy Ghost Fathers. Secular priests trained here soon filled long neglected posts in France and by 1763 were entrusted with the care of the faithful in all French colonies. But by 1848 the French Revolution, Napoleon, and anti-clerical governments had played such havoc with the Congregation of the Holy Ghost that membership was down to thirteen and not one of these was fit for the office of superior general.

At this point Francis Mary Paul Libermann, a rabbi's son, came to the rescue. Ordained a priest in 1841 when thirty-nine years old, he founded nine days later his Congregation of the Holy Heart of Mary to work exclusively for Negroes. By 1848 he had thirty-four priest members and was in charge of West Africa's Vicariate of the Two Guineas stretching from modern Dakar to nearly the southern tip of Africa. Realizing that legal recognition by the French government was a necessary condition for the permanence of his congregation, and that he could acquire

such recognition only through suppression of his own congregation and union with one of the four in France which enjoyed this privilege (Holy Ghost Fathers, Vincentians, Sulpicians, and Foreign Mission Society of Paris), he allowed his larger and more vigorous congregation to be suppressed, taking on the name and rule of the Holy Ghost Fathers. Libermann was at once elected the eleventh superior general and today is called the second founder. He became the congregation's guiding spirit and soon after his election could say of the veteran Holy Ghost Fathers that they were "no longer attached to the former state of affairs," because he had "won them over completely." By 1853, the year after Libermann's death, public simple vows were a part of the rule. The growing congregation absorbed the Leonist Brothers (1855), the Brothers of the Annunciation (1901), and recently it has added the Brothers of St. Joseph in the French Cameroons.

Today the Holy Ghost Congregation conducts seminaries and other educational institutions throughout the world, engages in social work with emphasis on orphanages, and carries on foreign mission work especially in Africa. The astounding record of 27,508 Catholic marriages and only 488 mixed marriages in thirty-one African territories in 1955, a ratio of fifty-six to one, is indication enough of the thorough and successful mission methods used by this fourth largest of all congregations in the Church today. Father Koren, who lives up to his preface and distributes praise and blame when due, has given us a first class history of his congregation replete with photographs, maps, charts, graphs, and tables. The reader misses only a word of explanation on the interchange of "holy" (p. 103) and "immaculate" (p. 101) in the title of Libermann's congregation.

RAPHAEL M. WILTGEN

Divine Word Seminary
Techny

The Catholic Church in the Modern World. By E. E. Y. Hales. (Garden City: Hanover House. 1958. Pp. 312. $4.50.)

The author of *Pio Nono* here offers a survey of the history of the Church since the French Revolution. As in his biography of Pius IX, Mr. Hales shows great patience with and understanding of all points of view taken by the *dramatis personnae* in this story. Thus he analyzes Gregory XVI's stand understandingly, and at the same time explains sympathetically how Lammenais and Montalembert arrived at the liberal attitude so stringently condemned by Gregory XVI. The outstanding merit of this popular historical essay is the author's ability to see things

as they were rather than judging them by their results. Two interesting arguments emerge from Hales' survey of the Church's history since the French Revolution. The first is that "a close state control has been the chief evil from which the Church has suffered in modern times" (p. 229). The second is that accomplishments have been achieved through a dialogue between the conservative and liberal groups within the Church, that both are necessary for a healthy Church, and that in prudential matters neither is totally right nor totally wrong.

The author of a brief survey of a complex subject faces the difficult problem of leaving much unsaid and of apportioning space to the topics he elects to treat. Mr. Hales has followed the recent trend of giving more pages to the American story, four and a half chapters out of twenty-three, and of paying more attention to the Church's history in Protestant countries. One wonders, however, whether "Americanism" deserves as much space as the pontificate of Pius XII, and one is certain that Maynard is not the best authority, even for a popular treatment of the history of the American Church. This is, nonetheless, a generally excellent treatment of the modern Church in which the author makes many sound generalizations and passes sober judgment on the significance of events. Hales is at his best in the early and middle nineteenth century, and the quality of his work deteriorates noticeably after World War I. Few would agree, e.g., with his observation that "it was not until the Second World War had actually broken out that Hitler could be said to have waged a Kulturkampf" (p. 273). The pontificates of Pius XI and Pius XII are treated in a slight chapter each, whereas five chapters are devoted to the pontificate of Pius IX. Our only serious complaint about this otherwise excellent survey is that it tails off weakly after 1920, that, e.g., it makes no mention of Pius XII's liturgical reforms, to his teaching, or to missionary work in the twentieth century.

THOMAS P. NEILL

Saint Louis University

Origines et Formation du Catholicisme Social en Belgique, 1842-1909. By Rudolf Rezsohazy. (Louvain: Editions Nauwelaerts. 1958. Pp. xxiv, 432. 240 frs. b.)

Recent Belgian historians have explored in satisfying detail the relations of their Catholic countrymen to the political movements of the nineteenth century. What has been lacking is an examination of the origins of the Catholic social movement in Belgium along the lines that J. B. Duroselle has provided so brilliantly for France. It is a pleasure to report that the gap has been filled. Profiting by the framework of Duroselle's volume

and utilizing the many studies in related fields, the author has painstakingly acquainted himself with all available archival and published sources. The result is a magnificent work that would be worth having for the bibliography alone.

Belgium was the first continental country to be affected by industrialization. Its immediate social effects were as frightening as in England and elsewhere. Along with the terrible material and moral conditions of the new proletariat went a rapid dechristianization that was stimulated by ideas percolating downward from the voltairian bourgeoisie. This process had proceeded far enough by 1845 to attract the attention of the bishops, but no solution was offered beyond private charity. It was not until Catholics could see the plight of the worker, not as an individual accident but as a social phenomenon involving a large segment of society in involuntary and permanent insecurity, that a social Catholicism could arise. A few did so by the 1840's; but as in France, these pioneers were overwhelmed in the reaction after 1848 and with them went the hope of an early and energetic response.

The failure of the prophets to impress the body of Belgian Catholics meant that within a few decades Belgium was transformed from a Catholic nation to a nation with some Catholics. The Belgian working class soon adopted an anti-clerical and even anti-Catholic tone that facilitated the progress of the Socialists among them. This drift from the Church occurred during the period of the greatest expansion of the Belgian economy, with the rise of heavy industry, corporate business structures, tariff reductions, and large concentrations of industrial workers. Catholic efforts were principally directed toward moral uplift in a paternalistic fashion. Their failure is indicated by the fact that by 1880 the workers in big industry and mining were firmly grouped behind the red flag. Social Catholicism, when it appeared, would be committed to an attempt at reconquest.

By the end of the 1860's, a small minority, grouped around Ducpétiaux, had begun to take positions that were later to develop as Christian democracy: a conviction that the workers should participate in government; an espousal of structural social changes; an acceptance of state intervention; a willingness to fight for worker emancipation and social progress; a recognition of the diversification of class interests and the need for distinct organizations for workers and employers; an appeal beyond charity to right and justice. They introduced an embryonic social program in the 1864 congress held at Malines, but they met intense opposition from paternalistic Catholics. It was not until after the revolutionary strikes of 1886 and the congresses of Liége that the movement gained momentum. Conservative opposition remained strong and there were appeals to the Holy See. But slowly the social minded Catholics won a place for themselves in the Catholic Party and developed a network of educational,

co-operative, insurance, and trade union activities that are the foundations of today's achievements. M. Rezsohazy's volume ends with 1909 and the justification of the pioneer's faith that the Christian ethic could meet the challenge of modern society.

This is one of the best of the impressive list of studies that Belgian Catholics have produced since World War II. Strictly documented, it is lively in style and ample in analysis. If a reader would care to follow the fruit of these efforts in contemporary Belgium, *Informations catholiques internationales* of June 1, 1958, gives the latest information.

JOSEPH N. MOODY

Ladycliffe College

AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

Archives of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe, 1678-1900. By Angelico Chavez, O.F.M. (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History. 1958. Pp. 283. $7.50.)

Literally thousands of both loose and bound documents, some dating back to the period immediately preceding the Pueblo Revolt of 1680, have been compiled, classified, and edited by Father Angelico Chavez, well-known southwestern poet and historian. Although several men had previously made the preliminary compilation and had actually begun the classification of these valuable papers, it was the work of Fray Angelico in what he calls an "extracurricular project" spread over a number of years that has brought to the knowledge of historical as well as genealogical societies much information of a social, economic, religious, and political nature. Unfortunately, only two documents of the pre-Pueblo Revolt period have survived so that basically the archives contain information from 1680 to 1900 with the richest representation covering the years 1760-1869. The destruction of the vast body of ecclesiastical records gathered at Santo Domingo, the Franciscan mission headquarters, in 1680, as well as the loss of other records in floods, church fires (so common in colonial periods), Indian raids, etc., has been irreparable. What remains, however, and is now almost completely codified in this work is of tremendous value.

The loose documents have been divided into three categories: the *diligencias matrimoniales,* greater in number than all loose papers combined; the loose documents of the missions from 1680 to 1850; and those papers having to do with Santa Fe's diocesan affairs from 1850 to 1900. The second of these categories contains small bits of information which the author has summarized and translated into English and which add greatly to our knowledge of the social history of the Southwest. In one of these,

dated 1731, the visitor general, Fray Juan Menchero, forbade the friars to go to Santa Fe without a written permit of the vice-custos; a second offense would result in their being brought by secular arm before the custos. Another (1783) describes measures to be taken by officials and missionaries to handle fugitives from their villages who formed bandit gangs, while another (1797) contains a list of donations to the king for the prosecution of the war. One of the longer documents of 1825 contains a petition of the citizens of Santa Cruz to bury the dead inside the church during the winter because of frozen ground, a petition to which the cathedral chapter emphatically refused assent. The bound volumes, all manuscript, are divided into five classes or books: books of *patentes* (official letters from Franciscan major superiors), books of accounts, containing local inventories and accounts, and books of baptisms, marriages, and burials.

The editor explains in the introduction that since these archives are private records and that there exist no facilities at present to supervise their use, they are not open to the public. Archbishop Byrne of Santa Fe has, however, generously granted the Utah Genealogical Society of Salt Lake City and the Huntington Library of San Marino, California, permission to photograph the material in the files. Ultimately, then, this valuable collection will be available to scholars and research students at these two centers.

STEPHEN DONLON

St. Michael's College
Santa Fe

What Happened to Religious Education? The Decline of Religious Teaching in the Public Elementary School, 1776-1861. By William Kailer Dunn. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1958. Pp. xv, 346. $5.00.)

Father Dunn's book is "a reworking, in some parts," of a doctoral dissertation completed at the Johns Hopkins University in 1956. The volume opens with a presentation of the dilemma set up in American life by the apparent conflict between two traditional beliefs: that religion belongs in public life and hence should be in education for the sake of citizenship, and that the United States is a nation dedicated to freedom of conscience and hence its tax-supported schools may not impose religious doctrines on pupils. In tracing the solutions offered for this dilemma between the period of national independence and the Civil War the author acknowledges that a legal tradition in state educational legislation—beginning with the Massachusetts textbook law of 1827 which prohibited school boards from purchasing any books "calculated to favor any particular sect or tenet" (p. 104)—has excluded the teaching of religious doctrines from the public

schools. The purpose of the present study has been to seek out from the historical record the events which led to the passing of the First Amendment and various state laws (p. 11) as well as "to probe behind the declarations, the controversies and the practices of educators" (p. 190) in order to document the presence of the persistent American social tradition that "religion belongs."

After a careful sifting of evidence from education laws, textbooks, curricular practices, reports of boards of education, arguments used in controversies, and the opinions of lay and educational leaders during the period under investigation, the author arrives at several significant conclusions. Regarding the First Amendment, Father Dunn differs sharply with Dr. John S. Brubacher and Justice Felix Frankfurter in concluding that the amendment was not "originally intended to regulate the problem of the relation between government and religion-in-education. The problem, as a constitutional problem, did not exist at the time" (p. 48). Moreover, the Massachusetts law of 1827, according to the author, would seem to have reflected the philosophy of the freedom of religion clause of the First Amendment rather than the disestablishment of religion clause (p. 116). Denying that the chief causes of the secularization of public education lie in the stress on secular subjects in the curriculum, or in the centralization of educational authority (pp. 281, 308), Father Dunn posits as the determining factor the conviction that "whereas religion itself belonged in public life and public education, the inculcation of sectarian doctrine in public schools constituted a violation of the rights of conscience and the democratic concept of the free exercise of religion" (pp. 116, 308 f). His research has led him to the belief that this has been more of a negative result of "the failure of religious minded Americans to solve their great dilemma than it was a positive result of avowed secularist activity" (p. 303). Insofar as the action taken by the Catholic hierarchy in this matter is concerned Father Dunn denies that the bishops intended to remove all religious influence from public education; rather they were only appealing to the principle of freedom of conscience in objecting to "the sectarian method by which Catholic children were learning about the sacred books" (pp. 267 ff.).

On the whole this work does not enter into the controversies that revolved around this delicate question. It does, however, imply several searching questions, e.g., why did Horace Mann whose solution in the dilemma shaped the pattern for Massachusetts—and subsequently for the nation—and who was familiar with the European plan of "to each his own" in the question of religion in public education, not allow this successful arrangement to influence his own theories for American schools (pp. 127, 187)? Again, although he does not comment at length, Father Dunn cites educational leaders who regarded Christianity as "coterminous

with Protestantism," and who desired that the lessons in ethics, natural religion, and the Bible to be imparted by the public school be "scriptural truth as received by the great body of Protestant Christians in the United States" (pp. 156, 195, 271). Does this help to explain, perhaps, the apparent determination of New England leaders to "protestantize the Catholic children: through the public school" (p. 273)? And does it not illuminate Edwin P. Van Kleeck's assertion that it was Protestant envy of the growth of Catholic schools that helped to promote state education at the expense of the traditional American regard for the prior rights of parents in the educational process (p. 255)?

This work is richly documented and offers an abundance of evidence from original sources. It need not—and does not—linger over old battlefields. Father Dunn's scholarly and balanced study stands on the merits of its objectivity and looks toward a solution in which neither the legal nor the social tradition will gain at the other's loss. As such the volume is a worthy addition to the distinguished series of educational monographs that have come from the Johns Hopkins Press.

JOHN WHITNEY EVANS

Cathedral Senior High School
Duluth

American Protestantism and Social Issues, 1919-1939. By Robert Moats Miller. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1958. Pp. xiv, 385. $6.00.)

Had the title of the present work, originally a doctoral dissertation, included the adjective "some" before "social issues," it would have more adequately described its contents. The author, assistant professor of history in the University of North Carolina, has not attempted to canvass opinions within all Protestant churches nor on all social questions. Prohibition, e.g., was certainly a much mooted question during these two decades; yet save for the elections of 1928 and 1932 it is ignored. Nor can it be said that the author has sampled all types of Protestant churches. No attention is paid to the large Negro denominations and to the growing sects on the right wing of Evangelicalism. While these latter groups are not noted for a highly developed social consciousness, a survey of the climate of opinion on the race question within the Negro churches would certainly be interesting. And one wonders whether the Scottsboro boys, who are discussed, are more important social issues than divorce, birth control, and gambling which are passed over.

Yet the author, faced with a multitude of churches and an abundance of issues, had to delimit his field of investigation. He has selected for

inspection the largest and most important Protestant churches—the Congregationalist, Episcopalian, Unitarian, Disciples of Christ, United Lutheran, Evangelical and Reformed, and the northern and southern divisions of the Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians. Attention has been paid to inter-denominational agencies, notably the Federal Council of Churches, and the more important religious periodicals, denominational and undenominational. The issues chosen are grouped under five general headings: the social order, civil liberties, labor, race relations, and war and peace.

Due to limitations of space, the book necessarily treats a large number of interesting topics only briefly. It is to be hoped that Dr. Miller will publish expanded versions in monographs or articles. For the book is based on wide and solid research and is marked by a calm and judicious viewpoint. An example would be the chapter on the election of 1928. Large sections of the book are devoted to the Socialist and Communist impact on the Protestant ministry. On this touchy topic, the author writes with prudence, yet with as much frankness as is possible. While one might disagree with some of Dr. Miller's conclusions, his book presents valuable insights in the social thought of Protestantism between the two world wars.

FRANCIS X. CURRAN

Loyola Seminary
Shrub Oak

GENERAL HISTORY

On the Philosophy of History. By Jacques Maritain. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1957. Pp. xi, 180. $3.50.)

For some years students of the philosophy of history have awaited a detailed treatment of the subject from Jacques Maritain. It is a subject which Professor Maritain, by his own admission, avoided for a long time, because of a distrust of Hegel, with whom the philosophy of history was at one time identified. When, however, Monsignor Charles Journet contributed an essay, "D'une philosophie chrétienne de l'histoire," to the *Revue Thomiste* volume *Jacques Maritain, Son Oeuvre Philosophique,* Professor Maritain himself seemed to be mildly surprised that he had, indeed, made several incursions into the field in his discussion of other problems.

The present volume, edited by Professor Joseph W. Evans, is made up chiefly of four lectures delivered at the University of Notre Dame in 1955, dealing successively with the problem of historical knowledge in general, axiomatic laws or statements which trace the regularity of basic relationships in the course of history, an examination of formulas con-

cerning the direction of historical development, God and the mystery of the world. The author is Augustinian, of course, in rejecting historical cyclicism in favor of a linearism which culminates in a final *eschaton*. Quite obviously he does not believe that it is the function of a philosophy of history to lay bare the metaphysical process or to indulge in prophecy. As history is not a problem to be solved, but a mystery to be contemplated, human freedom precludes the possibility of a formation of rigorous laws of historical development. Humble professional diligence can, however, discern basic trends, general characteristics, and intelligible directions. Moreover, the philosophy of history, though essentially a part of moral philosophy concerned with the practical order, necessarily presupposes metaphysics and philosophy of nature as any practical discipline presupposes a theoretical truth. Professor Maritain feels also that a knowledge of anthropology is indispensable to the philosopher of history.

Particularly stimulating is the essay, "God and the Mystery of the World." Although many of his observations on divine and human freedom have been treated in *Existence and the Existent* (New York, 1948), he is at his best in a brief treatment of divine eternity, and a discussion of what he calls "anthropocratic," "satanocratic," and "theocratic" illusions. The first he identifies with a semi-Pelagian self sufficiency, the second with a repudiation of the world, and the third with the attempt to elevate the socio-political order into the kingdom of God. It is to be hoped that Professor Maritain will supplement these essays, somewhat in the manner of Karl Löwith in his work, *The Meaning of History* (Chicago, 1949), with studies of the prominent personalities in the field.

ROBERT PAUL MOHAN

The Catholic University of America

The Nature of Biography. By John A. Garraty. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1957. Pp. xi, 289, xiii. $5.00.)

In his recent presidential address to the American Historical Association, William L. Langer aroused some comment from both the gentlemen of the press and from the banqueting historians when he suggested that the "next assignment" for the profession was a wider application of social psychology and psycho-analysis to the study of history and biography. For those who had already read *The Nature of Biography* before considering Professor Langer's proposal, the latter seed fell upon ground broken, if not previously planted. For Mr. Garraty's excellent volume was originally conceived in his intent to discover "how much of the biographer's success depends on his understanding of human motivation and of such processes as rationalization, sublimation, and repression." Although the

finished study includes both a history of the development of biography, and a discussion of the biographical method, some of the most interesting sections of the book relate to precisely this problem: the extent to which psychology, psycho-analysis, and the techniques of personality study may improve the writing of biography.

In the first section of the volume which deals with the development of biography, Garraty suggests that the new science of psychology was the exception to the generalization that deterministic science of the nineteenth century discouraged the study of the individual. Psychology and biography interacted in ways stimulating to both disciplines. Havelock Ellis in 1896 argued that biography was really a branch of applied psychology, while Sigmund Freud in 1910 demonstrated the applicability of psycho-analysis to biography in his study of Leonardo da Vinci. "After 1910 psycho-analytical thinking began to leave its mark on biography." In America the technique was seized upon by men like James Harvey Robinson, Harry Elmer Barnes, and Preserved Smith. Subsequent friends of psychoanalytic biography included Katharine Anthony, Joseph Wood Krutch, Ralph V. Harlow, Leon Pierce Clark, Clement Wood, and Lewis Mumford.

The method had, of course, its opponents; critics like Charles Whibley asserted angrily, "The worst foe of biography . . . is the disciple of Freud, who crawls like a snail over all that is comely in life and art." Jacques Barzun was not edified by a method which seemed merely to substitute one jargon for an older one. Stephen Vincent Benet, André Maurois, James Truslow Adams, and Bernard De Voto felt that it was folly to take psychoanalytical biography seriously. Conservative criticism led to a decline in the "new" biography, and after 1940 most of the radical forms, including the psychoanalytical approach, were out of fashion.

In the second section of *The Nature of Biography* where method is discussed Garraty asserts that the psychoanalytical approach can be useful if "the evidence is plentiful and the conditions clear." It is his thesis that if tolerance and co-operation prevail historians and biographers can learn a great deal from the psychologists. Many techniques used by the latter could be borrowed by the former: studies of handwriting, mechanical analysis of the elements and ideas of the subject's writings, measuring tension, the value-analysis, to name a few. "It seems clear," the author says, "that content analysis offers history and biography a new area of research." Like Langer, he encourages biographers to draw upon social psychology as well. "Anything that psychology has to say about the motives, actions, and psychological processes of people in general which can be applied to particular persons ought to be listened to attentively by biographers." The biography of the future would thus be able to reconcile the many seeming contradictions in human character, "leading not to simplification, but to understanding."

The size of this volume naturally precludes a compendium and the author has selected those biographies which illustrate the principles he means to emphasize both in the development and the method of the writing of biography. Some aspects of biography, such as hagiography, are given only a grudging nod, once the mediaeval period has been treated (pp. 55-62). Contemporary hagiography is discounted with remarks like: "There is little essential difference between a medieval saint's life and a contemporary movie biography, where vice is always punished, virtue has its quittance, and the individual is subordinated to a formula"; or, "As in the era of saints' lives, the invention of last year's 'student' becomes the 'source' of next year's." One is reminded of the recent suggestion of Robert D. Cross that nineteenth-century hagiography was only part of the sedulously cultivated attempt to foster devotional spirit as an antidote to the challenges of nineteenth-century science. "Devout Catholic authors produced a flood of devotional . . . biographies of saints so replete with supernatural occurrences as to require of the reader an almost continuous act of faith," Cross comments. [*The Emergence of Liberal Catholicism in America* (Cambridge, 1958), p. 7.] It would seem that a separate study of this form of biography merits the attention of some writer who shares an interest in the nature of biography.

John A. Garraty has done a service of genuine merit, not only by clarifying some of the trends in biography, supporting the stimulating "assignment" of Dr. Langer, and suggesting further areas of research; he has presented a volume of wide appeal and usefulness. His manner of presentation is graceful, and he may be read by people in and out of the profession with equal enjoyment. Seminars in English and history will find his essay on sources very valuable. All in all, this is a splendid little volume deserving wide circulation.

ANNABELLE M. MELVILLE

Bridgewater Teachers College

The Art of Architecture. By Sir Albert Richardson and Hector O. Corfiato. (New York: Philosophical Library, Inc. 1956. 3rd edition. Pp. xxviii, 663. $25.00.)

One of the things accomplished by the busy times in which we live is that we have been made miserly readers. With pressing demands from all sides squeezing our too-short reading intervals, we have come to hoard these precious hours, and to spend them thriftily. It is fortunate, therefore, when we find a single book which opens for us doors to many parts of an entire world. In *The Art of Architecture* Sir Albert Richardson and Professor Corfiato, both of the University of London, have given us just

this. The book is, in effect, a single volume library on architecture. It is a cross-slice of history in search of underlying principles, and on the way it develops a basis for the critical evaluation of architecture through theory of design, planning, structure, and decoration. The broad scope, coupled with the book's essentially philosophical approach, has resulted in a work which is appreciated by architects, but which may well prove more valuable to others. It is not easy to read, not a volume to be read through, but neither is it a reference work. Rather it is one which the reader will dip into, and when he has made friends with it and caught its pattern, he will return to it for spaced-out evenings as he would carry on a running discussion with a scholar friend. The authors' earnest desire to keep constantly in mind the "oneness" of all considerations affecting design frequently suggests in the middle of one train of thought the most tantalizing beckonings in other directions. And if you take the start of a sentence too seriously as an indication of your destination, you may find yourself unseated on some unexpected turn before the end. But you will have enjoyed the ride, and profited, too!

In essence, the authors deny the doctrine of functionalism, nor are they to be aligned with those who believe either that architectural excellence derives primarily from an understanding use of materials, or from the expression of structural order. They hold rather that ". . . art depends on the spiritual character of a period to a greater degree than to exact observance of prevalent material conditions." And again they state, "Architecture is largely the result of predetermined thought, controlling the adaptation of form and material to ever changing needs." Thus repeating their basic premise with this theme refrain: "The exercise of the imagination determines the progress of architecture," the authors are able to pass rather lightly over the technical problems of architecture as related to man's material needs, and those concerned with constructing and conditioning space, which make so many architectural books unintelligible to non-architect readers.

Convinced that "architectural design has its roots for new achievement in the history of what has been," Richardson and Corfiato devote much space to a review of the history of architecture from ancient Greece and Rome to the present time. Parts of this portion of the book, which become merely chronological and descriptive could, perhaps, have been deleted and thus have strengthened the presentation of the philosophic theme. One likewise wonders how this work could have reached a third edition without a much needed editing of the half-tone illustrations. Placement of these photographs in the rear section of the book breaks the relation to the text. And since there are so many good, and even unusual, photographs of seldom pictured buildings, they merit trimming and rearrangement. But the shortcomings of the work are out-weighed by its valuable contribution

to understanding of the business of building, in which, to use Constable's phrase from the foreword, "Man's conception of his place in the Universe has always found particularly clear expression."

THOMAS H. LOCRAFT

The Catholic University of America

Troy: Settlements VIIa, VIIb, and VIII. By Carl W. Blegen, Cedric G. Boulter, John L. Caskey, Marion Rawson. (Princeton: Princeton University Press for the University of Cincinnati. Volume IV, Part 1: Text; Part 2, Plates. Pp. xxvi, 328; xxvix, 380 numbered illustrations and plans. $36.00.)

Volumes I-III of this monumental work have already been reviewed in this journal [XXXVII (January 1952), 468-470; XXXVIII (January, 1953), 439-440; and XXXIX (January, 1954), 444-445]. There is no need, therefore, to repeat what has been said regarding the general background, plan, and scope of the work, and the contents of the previous volumes. Volume IV completes this great archaeological publication. It covers Troy VIIa, the Troy of Priam and Homer, Troy VIIb, a settlement that had two distinct phases and lasted to about 1100 B.C., and Troy VIII which began about 700 B.C. and continued without marked changes to Alexander. Apart from the description of the two sanctuaries found on the southwestern slope outside the citadel, the remains of Troy IX, Hellenistic and Roman Troy are not treated in this volume, but will be dealt with in a series of supplementary monographs. As in the earlier volumes, full recognition has been given to the earlier excavations made by Schliemann, and especially to those of Dörpfeld, but the earlier work is dwarfed by the extent of the excavations carried out by the Cincinnati expedition, which is characterized, furthermore, by the meticulous care of its participating scholars and the high quality of their classification and interpretation of evidence.

It is established that Troy VIIa had a very short existence, perhaps, not more than thirty or forty years (c. 1275-c. 1240 B.C.), that it was subjected to siege, capture, and destruction, and that the date of its fall corresponds roughly to that found in Greek tradition. Evidence for contacts with Mycenaean Greece before the fall was discovered, but was relatively scanty. Contrary to what might be expected, archaeological excavation furnished no data, during the period of Troy VIIa, for contacts across the Hellespont or with its hinterland. Troy VIIb, as noted above, includes two distinct stages in the resettlement of the site. After the fall of Troy VIIa, the survivors reoccupied the area and were undisturbed for, perhaps, a generation, but not much longer. They were then overcome, but not

exterminated, by invaders, probably from Thrace, whose presence is clearly revealed by their crude handmade pottery—called Knobbed Ware by the excavators. Troy VIIb came to an end about 1100 B.C., and there was no appreciable occupation of the site for the next three or four centuries. Troy VIII, founded about 700 B.C., was a Greek settlement. Its culture was closely related to that of the contemporary East Greek and Aeolic settlements along the coast of western Asia Minor. Greek Troy before Alexander had some importance in the seventh and sixth centuries but was a stagnant place in the fifth and fourth. This in brief is the story that archaeology has to tell about Troy from 1300 to 330 B.C.

To praise these concluding volumes of *Troy* would be superfluous. They have already taken their place as a truly great and model publication in archaeology. They are fittingly dedicated to Luise Taft Semple and William Taft Semple who made possible the archaeological expedition of the University of Cincinnati and who by their own labors and financial aid did so much to bring its work to such a splendid conclusion. Is it too much now to ask that the authors keep the promise made in the foreword of Volume III, viz., "in a briefer and more general survey, to reconstruct the history of Troy and to consider it in its broader setting"?

MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE

The Catholic University of America

Social and Political Thought in Byzantium. From Justinian I to the Last Palaeologus. Passages from Byzantine Writers and Documents translated with an Introduction and Notes. By Ernest Barker. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1957. Pp. xvi, 239. $4.80.)

This volume, a sequel to Sir Ernest Barker's *From Alexander to Constantine,* falls into two sections: the introduction (forming Part I) and the translated texts—writings of statesmen, churchmen, philosophers—supplied with valuable commentaries (Parts II-V and appendix). Although the author apologizes for his—not a professed Byzantinist's—"inroad into the territory of Byzantium" (p. vii), his introduction is a brilliant vindication of his right of denizenship in the *pars Orientalis.* In it he treats Byzantine society with a great penetration, as a carrier of political *thought,* of which political *theory* (to use his own distinction) was an expression. Not being a professed Byzantinist has protected the author from the contagion of partisan spirit by which the atmosphere of a part of the Byzantinist territory of today, no less than of the Byzantine territory of yore, appears pervaded; and his wholesome fairness affords a pleasant relief after so much anti-western sentiment in recent historical literature. Nor is he blind to the "infertility" of Byzantine political thought, as

compared with that of the mediaeval West. Two among the several causes he adduces for this appear to me as preponderant. Sir Ernest speaks of the shedding of the Latin and Roman tradition (p. 2, cf. pp. 27-28). Indeed, Byzantine civilization can be regarded as subject to a process of contraction, of retrogression away from the pan-Mediterranean cultural and political unity of the *pax romana:* from that final syncretism back to an East-Mediterranean, Hellenistic unity, then to a Balkan-Aegean, national Greek unity, and at last to the nucleal dimensions of a Greek city-state. This back-wardness chained the Byzantines to antiquity, and, moreover, to Greek antiquity only. While the West enjoyed the heritage of both the Greek and the Latin cultural tradition and freely adapted the Latin tongue to the current ideational needs, Byzantium suffered from the monopoly of the "oppressive weight of the . . . inheritance from ancient Greece" (p. 4), which enforced its deadening forms alike upon thought and language (p. 14). The other cause of the comparative poverty of Byzantine thought was the burden of Caesarism. The fact that there was only one accepted theory of the *basileia,* "a theory unchallenged and uncontroverted, . . . sole and supreme" (p. 1), precluded any discussion and prevented the high and free development as in the West (cf. pp. 14-16); there is contradiction here with the unqualified assertion that "the Roman Church . . . has challenged the individual's freedom of thought" (p. 7). Among other causes, Sir Ernest ranges a certain intellectual stagnation of Byzantine monasticism (pp. 14-15) and a certain artificiality of Byzantine education (pp. 15-18, 42-45). The latter he connects with a monoglottal "in-breeding," which was, I must add, due also to Byzantine microcosmism (cf. CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, XL [January, 1955], 421-422); and he might have mentioned the divorce that existed—quite the contrary of the West—between monasticism and secular education. There were, however, some non-Greek and contemporary influences at play; and it is a pity that, in referring to them, the author should have been so completely unaware of the Georgian connection, not to say background, of the Barlaam and Joasaph romance (pp. 18, 25, 81; cf. D. M. Lang, *The Wisdom of Balahvar* [New York, 1957]; "The Life of the Bl. Iodasaph, etc.," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* XX [1957], 389-407; and "St. Euthymius the Georgian, etc.," *ibid.,* XVII [1955], 306-325).

A great part of Byzantine, as of western, thought and theory was concerned with the correlation of religion and polity, a concern unknown before the advent of Christianity; and Sir Ernest has much to say about it. Yet, here, his presentation is less the booty of a free invader than the neat clichés packed for export from Byzantinist territory. These goods I, for one, find it difficult to accept. One may, of course,—and this is precisely what is often done today—view Byzantine religious history as one contin-

uous and organic whole labelled "Byzantine," "Eastern," "Greek," or "Orthodox Church." There is, indeed, enough outward continuity, of ritual and language, of ethnic, political, and cultural associations; there is, moreover, the impact of the Greek Orthodox claims, to invest this view with plausibility. Yet we way well wonder whether this is not telescoping and over-simplifying a very complex story. On closer analysis the history in question can be shown to lack true continuity and to fall instead into two different periods, the Catholic and the non-Catholic, or Greek Orthodox. In the first period, the Byzantine Christians, unlike their descendants in the second, formed an integral part, constituted a province, of the supra-national and supra-political religious organization, centered in the See of Peter, which we know as the Catholic Church. It does not matter here what rank in it, after that see, the Bishop of Constantinople might claim for himself. And the Byzantines shared in that organization's consciousness of itself, of its own organic—jurisdictional, dogmatic, sacramental—unity and of the laws governing that unity. This is a matter of historical record, of which such authoritative documents as the *Libellus* of St. Hormisdas and the similar papal formularies solemnly accepted by Byzantine churchmen in 519, 681, 787, etc., are parts that first spring to mind. To overlook this inner difference for an outward continuity of detail is to judge the situation with some superficiality.

This is not to say, of course, that there did not obtain in that Byzantine province, from the very days of Constantine I, a *Los von Rom* trend. It is precisely in connection with this trend that the role of Caesarism assumes its great significance. Echoing a fad in modern Byzantinology, the author would deny the existence of Byzantine Caesaropapism (pp. 6-10, 12), though he would elsewhere admit it prior to the failure of Iconoclasm (pp. 36-37). The semantic argument against the term itself (p. 7) is beside the point, since it is not *what* the Byzantines called their rulers (*autokratores,* not *kaisares*) that matters to us who use it, but our own choice, on grounds not devoid of antiquity and authority, of "Caesar" for denoting either temporal power in general or its embodiment, the ruler. And it is over-simplifying things to tell us that "it is *not* true that they [the emperors] were 'popes'" (p. 7). Of course, they were not! But they *tended* to be popes. Here, again we must avoid *simplisme.* The emperor ("caesar") tended to be pope, not in the sense of high priest ("Head of all the holy priests of God," as Justinian I put it; e.g., *Code,* I.1.7): *that,* obviously, he never was; but indeed in the sense which distinguishes the pope from other bishops and priests, i.e., that of supreme ruler, supreme teacher, and center of unity in the Church ("Head of all the holy Churches," in Justinian's words; cf. *Code,* I.1.8). The tendency of the Byzantine autocrats of the first period toward assuming the latter aspect of papal authority cannot be seriously called in question; that

they, moreover, actually acquired much of it, i.e., that the tendency was fully accepted by the Greek Orthodox Church, as it had not been by the Catholic Church, seems sufficiently borne out by some of the ecclesiastical texts collected in this volume. Juxtaposing the canonist Balsamon (pp. 105-107; on page 105, first line, the statement that the emperor can do all—*hē basilikē exousia panta dynatai poiein*—is left untranslated) with the Patriarch Antony IV (pp. 194-196) creates the impression that the former's were *not* "extreme views that go beyond the general opinion of the Greek Church" (p. 109 n. 1); and this impression would only be strengthened, if other authoritative pronouncements were included, such, e.g., as those of the canonists Chomatenus (to the effect that the emperor is *tōn Ekklēsiōn epistēmonarchēs,* representing all the pontifical privileges, save only holy orders; in Leunclavius, V, 317) and Macarius of Ancyra (following Chomatenus and adding that Christ entrusted the Church to the *basileus, ap.* Dositheus, *Tomos katallegēs,* pp. 194-195), or of the Emperor Isaac II Angelus [*ap.* Nicet. Choniates, *Hist.* (Bonn, 1835), p. 583]. Sir Ernest himself, as a matter of fact, sums up the situation rather neatly—though he fails to distinguish between the tendency toward papal powers and the acquisition of them—when he says: "the emperor ... was regarded as in, and of, the Church, *standing at its centre, a part (and indeed the heart) of its life*" (p. 37; italics mine). And yet, in the same breath, he affirms "that the Byzantine Church was not a Church which lived and moved under a system of Caesarism or Erastianism, or acknowledged the supremacy of civil power in matters spiritual" (p. 35). The solution of this difficulty seems to lie in what he advances as his reason for the rejection of the second of the above two terms. There was no Erastianism in the Byzantine Church-State relations, he assures us, because the arrangement "did not mean that the lay power, *as such,* was supreme in and over the Church. It meant that the emperor, as an *integral part* of the Church, had rights and duties in the Church. The rights indeed were notable" (p. 8). Actually, terms are of little importance: it is the facts of the tendency and of the acquisition that matter, and they have here, as elsewhere, been sufficiently admitted by the author.

Unfortunately, to repeat, he does not distinguish between them. Thus while in the second period pontifical powers are officially rendered to Caesar, in the first, as is evidenced by Justinian I's legislation (cf. pp. 75-76) on the *Epanagōgē* (cf. pp. 89-96), a clear distinction was still made between civil and religious authority. It is impossible, therefore, to agree—and here the author rather overstates the case for Caesaropapism!—that "from Constantine to Justinian there had been little difference between *imperium* and *sacerdotium:* the emperor had been regarded as a bishop, and saluted as *sacerdos* and *archiereus*" (p. 75). Separating God's things from Caesar's is a principle inherent in Christianity, and the fact of the

first notice of it in Byzantine legal literature (Justinian's *Novella* VI) does not signify that the Catholic emperors, whatever their acts and tendencies, had been ignorant of it. Justinian was a ruler least likely to curtail his own legal rights; he was merely bowing to the existing principle. There seems to be, moreover, a confusion here between Constantine I's claim to be *episkopos tōn ektos,* i.e., of the pagans (cf. Palanque in Fliche-Martin, *Histoire de l'Eglise,* III, 63; also Barker, p. 36), and the pontifical epithets used of the emperors which, as Ensslin has shown, were empty titulary survivals—even beyond Justinian's day—of the pagan *pontifex maximus.*

In connection with all this, there is one very important point which is rather understated—another cliché—in the introduction. It is that the question of whether the above imperial tendency was or was not compatible with Christianity was troubling the Byzantine province of the Church and caused in it a division and a struggle. From the start the struggle went on between the purely Catholic current—men like Athanasius, John Damascene, Theodore Studite—which, in union with the Apostolic See, insisted upon the Christian tradition of social dualism and said no to that question (though it might occasionally be bullied into a temporary silence); and, on the other hand, the current—so many of the clergy forming part of it—which we may call Political and which, obeying "the old pre-Christian tradition of the all-inclusive single society, with its head responsible alike for secular and religious affairs and acting as both a priest and a ruler" (p. 36), said yes. It was by the latter, not the former trend, that the emperor "was acknowledged, and even invited, to be God's vicegerent *in* the Church and to act as His mediator in establishing its doctrine" (*ibid.*).The Catholics might ask the Catholic ruler to defend the doctrine of the Church, not to establish it. This, in other words, was a conflict between a *Caesaro-centric* and a *Petro-centric* conception of Christianity. The visible Church must needs have a determining center of unity; and the question so often posed in history simply is whether it be determined by a secular and, from the Christian point of view, necessarily outside, factor, or from the inside by a purely religious one. The question troubling the Byzantines of the first period was, thus, one of choice between two incompatible things: the Christian principle of the primacy of the spiritual and the pre-Christian practice (whatever the protestations to the contrary) of determining the spiritual by the temporal. To refer, finally, to the Catholic resistance to the Caesaro-centrism of the Politicals (and, occasionally, of the heterodox) as a proof of the Greek Orthodox Church's inherent freedom from secular control (pp. 8-9) is no less extraordinary than would be an attempt to argue the same freedom of the Anglican Establishment by appealing to the example of St. Thomas More.

The second period of Byzantine religious history began when, between Photius and Cerularius, the Caesaro-centric current had proved victorious and the Byzantine province of the Catholic Church had become an empire-determined Church outside the Petrine communion. With this, the old Catholic current had become desiccated as a merely clericalist one. The Clericalists, though believing as much as the Politicals in a temporally determined Church, insisted on running it (and occasionally even the State) in their own way. To compare such a typical Clericalist as Cerularius with such a defender of the primacy of the spiritual as Gregory VII is to miss completely their essential difference (p. 10, following Bury; in n. 10, "Isaac Angelus" is an error for Isaac I Comnenus).

The struggle of the first period had passed into the *symphonia* of the imperial establishment, as what had been the practice of civil authority became the doctrine of the clergy. Having failed to reduce the Catholic Church to a State institution and its head to a junior dyarch, the emperor had to be content with the Church's former Byzantine section and with the bishop of the capital heading it. The latter's position, indeed, grew at the expense of the other patriarchs in the empire: it was like having a pope of one's own. A curiously *ersatz* history that of Byzantium:—pseudo-Rome, pseudo-Romans, pseudo-pope, and (with the false claims to a foundation by St. Andrew the First-called, Peter's brother) a pseudo-Apostolic See! The arrangement did not last very long, however. Soon after the formation of the imperial Church, the empire itself was reduced to a national Greek state (1071). It was thus left to the former to carry on a while longer the imperial tradition: the Byzantine *oikoumenē* became for a moment an ecclesiastical rather than political reality, but one still determined by the ghost of the empire. This is what Sir Ernest must have in mind when he writes: "If the Byzantine Empire had been from the first essentially a Christian community, it assumed that character more and more in the process of time, and it became eventually more of a church than an empire" (p. 30). Its effective control over some of its dependencies, however, i.e., those in the now politically independent former parts and vassal states of the empire, could not long be maintained. In others, on the other hand, i.e., among the Melkites reduced by Islam, it increased, to the point of destroying their ancient liturgies and replacing them by that of Constantinople. But eventually, as the Byzantine State entered its final phase of the city-state, the imperial Church entered a national Greek phase. Temporal determination was its *raison d'être*, and it mattered little what form the temporal element might assume. The vestiges of the empire being quite obviously moribund, Greek nationality, the only vigorous temporal factor at hand, succeeded it as the determinant. Constantinople became ethno-centric, or (to borrow its own expression) phyletic, instead of Caesaro-centric. It is this ethno-centrism that explains

why the Palaeologan emperors, e.g., were so successfully resisted in their unionist efforts by the Byzantine mobs: they no longer determined the Byzantine religion. Once again, it is too *simpliste* to lump together this phyletist resistance, the Clericalist one of a Cerularius, and the Petro-centric resistance of the first phase as a proof of the freedom of the one "Greek Church" (pp. 8-10, 35).

The phyletism of Constantinople disrupted its short-lived ecclesiastical ghost-empire. Imperial Christendom followed the example of its center, and broke up into a number of ethnic churches, Greek, Caucasian, South Slavic, and, a little later, Russian. What still held together this loose federation and ensured for Constantinople a vague primacy of honor in it was the fact that this ecclesiastical organization continued to be determined by a unifying factor, as temporal as its preceding determinants: Byzantine civilization and, with it, the memory of the empire. From this late development the author deduces that federalism was a principle inherent in the "Byzantine Church" (pp. 35, 41-42). Actually, it was merely a *pis aller*, exactly as it had been for the empire. Of this fact the ecclesiastical annexationism of Constantinople at the expense of the Melkites and (with the aid of the Ottoman arms) of the South Slavs is sufficient demonstration. Nor can the heading "federalism" be applied, without further qualification, to the institution of the patriarchates and the theory of the pentarchy (pp. 41-42; surely, Rome was not the "fifth" patriarchate, p. 93, n. 1). The jurisdictional divisions called patriarchates had their beginning, and they still exist, in the Catholic Church; and the original pentarchal theory did not exclude, as did its eleventh-century development, the Petro-centric doctrine (cf. Jugie, *Theol. dogm. Chr. Or.*, IV, 450-461). Finally, the reduction to dependence of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem by Constantinople, as it became the quasi-Apostolic See of the imperial Church, tends to show that the theory in question remained mere theory, even in the Greek Orthodox phase.

There is, however, a unity in Byzantine religious history, one which gives a true continuity to its two disparate periods. This unity is in the fact that the religious development of Byzantium reflected the retrogression of Byzantine society already noted. We can see, thus, the Byzantines regress from the new Christian psychology of the supra-temporal Church, back to the old psychology of the pre-Christian empire's state religion, and finally to the still earlier psychological phase of tribal cults.

One more remark. As we read that Photius "sought . . . to defend. in his treatise 'on the mystagogy of the Holy Spirit', the main doctrine of the Greek Church, on the procession of the Holy Ghost" (p. 111), we are prompted to ask: which "Greek Church"—the Byzantine province of the Catholic Church, in the first period, or the Greek Orthodox, of the second? And telescoping is once again in evidence with the impression

created by these words that Photius defended an old doctrine against a western innovation. In actual fact, the exact opposite is the case. In opposing the ancient Latin interpretation of the doctrine of the double procession (*a Patre et a Filio;* whether he actually had the purely *textual* innovation of the *Filioque,* expressive of that old doctrine, in mind or no, is still disputed), Photius came out with a denial not only of that interpretation, but also of the equally ancient Greek version of the same doctrine (*a Patre per Filium*), and with a wholly novel doctrine of his own: the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone. The *Mystagogy,* unable to muster any Greek fathers for its defense, was obliged to pass over them in silence.

The foregoing should in no way detract from the great value of Sir Ernest Barker's volume. Its usefulness is very considerable, and the light it sheds on Byzantium is of greater importance than its few obscurities. The light, moreover, is largely the author's own contribution, whereas the obscurities seem to result from his too great reliance on some modern trends in Byzantinology. If the latter have been dwelt upon here, it is because the excellence of the book invites perfectionism and because these trends require a re-evaluation. The volume is supplied with a chronological table and an index of authors from whom passages are translated or quoted; it is well indexed and pleasantly bound.

CYRIL TOUMANOFF

Georgetown University

Six Historians. By Ferdinand Schevill. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1956. Pp. xiii, 201. $5.00.)

It is always pleasant and rewarding to meet a distinguished author of historical works to whom his profession is not just a less respectable branch of the "social sciences." In this sense we welcome the opportunity of renewing our contact with Ferdinand Schevill, a member of the original faculty of the University of Chicago and author of such standard volumes as the *History of Florence* and *The Great Elector.* His creed—as he frequently professed it—was: "History is literature, not science." The University of Chicago Press has edited six historiographical essays of the late Professor Schevill who died in 1954, to which have been added some fragments of notes for lectures on the history of historical writing. The six historians comprise Thucydides, St. Augustine, Machiavelli, Voltaire, Ranke, and Henry Adams.

No special scholarly research was done in preparing these essays; they were built on established facts and thus their merit depends on the new points of view. Many readers will be familiar with Dr. Schevill's

consummate skill and cultivated charm exhibited in his historical narrative; they will not be disappointed by the volume under review. As for the novelty of problems presented, the reviewer thinks that it is mainly to be found in the insistence on the concept of "History being literature," and such paragraphs or sentences as are devoted to the style of Ranke or Henry Adams are among the most valuable in the volume. But the reader may feel tempted to ask whether the problem of history and literature can be confined to such narrow limits as a—not completely satisfactory—analysis of style. Nor will he find a satisfactory answer in Emery Neff's *The Poetry of History* (New York, 1947) in spite of its more promising title. Dealing with very diverse periods and historical thinkers, the merit of Schevill's presentation varies according to what one might call the affinity of the author with the personalities portrayed. To this reviewer the high water mark is reached in the essays on Voltaire and Ranke while the opposite holds true for those concerned with St. Augustine and Machiavelli. There is an abominable statement, e.g., on Plato in the section on Thucydides (p. 12). Did Professor Schevill really think "that theology should have annihilated, nay blotted out for eight long centuries (after the appearance of the *City of God* in 426), what is commonly considered as history" (p. 57)? An interesting problem—and specially for the viewpoint of "history as literature, not science" is presented by Adams. In spite of the fact that valuable studies have recently appeared on this fascinating personality, one wishes that Professor Schevill had devoted much more space to the discussion of the author of *Mont-Saint-Michel* and *The Tendency of History*. While the reader will not claim that the problem has been answered in a definite way, one will be grateful to Ferdinand Schevill for having asked once more the question about the relationship between history and literature.

FRIEDRICH ENGEL-JANOSI

The Catholic University of America

The Frontier in Perspective. Edited by Walker D. Wyman and Clifton B. Kroeber. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 1957. Pp. xx, 300. $5.50.)

During the summer session of 1954 the University of Wisconsin honored the memory of the late Lyman C. Draper by a series of lectures under the title "Wisconsin Reconsiders the Frontier." *The Frontier in Perspective* is a result of these lectures. Thirteen essays comprise the book which is divided into two sections: the world frontier and the American frontier. The first of these ranges from early Roman colonization through Russian expansion eastward to the western world frontier. The several authors

attempt to show the influence of the different frontiers upon diverse peoples and their cultures. The reader soon realizes that although there was some similarity among frontiers, the difference between them was very great. Each could be studied by itself and different conclusions drawn from the several frontiers. These conclusions do not necessarily agree with the Turner thesis nor were they so designed.

The essay on Roman colonization points to the similarities found there and on the American frontier while "The Mediterranean Frontier, 1000-1400," shows a unique frontier condition in that the settlers did not move into a savage country, but to colonies already peopled by their own kind. The Spanish influence and their idea of expansion differs from that of the pioneer of the United States. Professor Zavala doubts that the Turner hypothesis could apply to the Hispanic frontier, yet he has not sufficient evidence to draw his own conclusions. On the other hand, Professor Burt seems to feel that Turner's thesis would apply to Canada, Australia, and New Zealand despite the seeming contradiction. A. Lobanov-Rostovsky points out that Russia had an eastern expansion rather than western and while he does show similarities he maintains that the results differ. The effect of the frontier upon Chinese history is far different from that attributed to the American frontier, yet Turner's implication seemingly can apply, viz., the environment and development of the frontier can influence a nation. Professor Webb's philosophic treatises on the western world frontier present his own hypothesis and suggest some provoking questions which may lead to new interpretations concerning the frontier.

Section two of the *Frontier in Perspective* concerns the American frontier and gives accounts not readily available elsewhere. A good example of this would be the first essay which treats of the southern frontier. In this piece Professor Abernethy contends that the Turner thesis does not apply, and he casts serious doubts upon the idea that the frontier produced democracy. Another who doubts the validity of the frontier hypothesis is Gates who studied the "Frontier Builders and Farm Laborers." He concluded that the Midwest was more complex and diversified than was formerly believed and that the people who moved into the area after the pioneers also affected that society. "Classics on the Midwest Frontier" modifies Turner's idea that the frontier took away European culture, and proves that the immigrants on the frontier kept alive western European culture in architecture, churches, schools, and the names of cities. Although Henry N. Smith in analyzing *Roughing It* to show the influence of the frontier upon literature does a very creditable work, he suggests that more could be done on the subject. Differing with Turner, Professor Hallowell feels that the American Indian had a beneficial, lasting effect upon our lives and culture.

Especially good are the bibliographies found after each essay. These are by no means definitive, but they are well chosen as a reference point for further study. *The Frontier in Perspective* could be used as a supplement to the study of the American frontier. The one criticism of the book is that questions are raised to which no precise answers can be given which thus leaves the reader with a feeling of helplessness.

THOMAS P. COFFEY

The Creighton University

A History of the English Speaking Peoples. Volume III. *The Age of Revolution.* By Winston S. Churchill. (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. 1957. Pp. xiv, 402. $6.00.)

Sir Winston Churchill has continued his history of the English-speaking nations in a volume devoted to an epochal period in their growth: the century and a quarter which elapsed from the accession of William and Mary to Wellington's victory at Waterloo. These years furnish much material for an exciting narrative and Sir Winston, a skilled story teller, has fully exploited their possibilities. In the majestic prose his readers have come to take for granted, he portrays the development of parliamentary monarchy in Great Britain; the victories won by Englishmen over their French enemies in all theaters of the world; the dissolution of the first British Empire and the establishment of a new English-speaking country in America; and at the end the successes won by the British over the menace of secular revolution and dictatorship.

Some readers, however, while thrilled by the account of great events, may feel disappointment at a lack of balance in the author's treatment. Sir Winston fails to make good the promise of his general title, for he says little about the people of England and America. He scarcely hints in these pages that these lands in the eighteenth century were undergoing tremendous social and economic, religious and intellectual changes. He has stressed rather the history of their wars and politics—and saluted their statesmen and military leaders. Beginning with his ancestor, Marlborough, continuing down to Nelson and Wellington—and not excepting Washington in America—Churchill acclaims the achievements of men who shaped their country's destinies. It should occasion no surprise, perhaps, that a man who has often been cited in his own generation as a savior of civilization should view history as a succession of indispensable men. Sir Winston may also fail to satisfy his readers in another way; for so far he has not integrated successfully the historical experiences of the two branches of the English-speaking peoples. His book is basically a history of England amplified with appropriate chapters on colonial America, the Revolution, and the founding of the United States. A more finished syn-

thesis might be difficult to execute, but so distinguished an author might have been expected to attempt it.

In any work of broad scope and general treatment, scattered errors of fact are almost inevitable, and Sir Winston may be forgiven the few which he has allowed to slip in. There are several inaccuracies, however, which the author or his publisher should have taken care to remove. In one place, Churchill curiously identifies the *asiento* contract awarded to England by the Treaty of Utrecht with the annual Porto Bello ship which the same treaty allowed her. When he deals with the colonial crisis of 1767-1768, he correctly describes John Dickinson's *Letters from a Farmer* as "studiously cautious in tone"; but his subsequent remark that "The authority of Parliament over the colonies was formally denied" surely gives a misleading view of Dickinson's theory, and is no more indicative of the general opinion in the colonies at that date. It is a slight error to call Burke's Civil Establishment Act of 1782 an "Economic Reform Act" (Burke and his contemporaries always called it "economical reform"); but it is more serious to state that this act disfranchised certain officials in the government. Churchill here has confused Burke's bill with another law passed at the same time which disqualified revenue officers from voting in parliamentary elections. Some students of the reform movement of the 1780's might also debate his description of Burke's act as a "tepid version" of his original scheme.

Since this history is designed to be read by the layman, rather than the specialist or advanced student, these inaccuracies are minor blemishes in a narrative of otherwise high merit. They should not deter the reader who is seeking dramatic incident, flashing insight into character, and the evocation of the purposes and ideals of two great nations. These are genuine virtues of historical writing, and Sir Winston Churchill has supplied a generous measure of each.

JAMES E. BUNCE

St. John's University
New York

A Short History of India. By W. H. Moreland and Atul Chandra Chatterjee (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1956. Pp. xii, 594. $6.00.)

The Transfer of Power in India. By V. P. Menon. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1957. Pp. 543. $8.50.)

Party Politics in India. By Myron Weiner. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1957. Pp. xiii, 319. $5.00.)

Taken collectively, these three works on India constitute an extremely good survey of India's history from the earliest recorded time to the

present day. Moreland and Chatterjee's volume, the fourth edition of a work originally published in 1936, concentrates on the two general themes of the evolution of Indian culture throughout the centuries and India's response in modern times to foreign contacts. The first third of the book covers the pre-Christian period; the second third runs from 1600 to 1900; and the last phase the developments of the twentieth century. The authors include in the main body of their work a quite adequate evaluation of the primary and secondary materials consulted or available in the preparation of each unit. Unfortunately, no comprehensive or collected bibliography was appended to the volume. Moreland and Chatterjee have made a particularly valuable contribution in this standard history in the chapters devoted to the philosophy and evolution of Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islamism. But the final unit covering the present century appears weak and incomplete.

Menon's work traces the chronological sequence of events from September, 1939, to August 15, 1947, during which time governmental control in India was passed from English hands to native constitutional government. The author was constitutional advisor to the governor general from 1942 to August, 1947, and hence was in an excellent position to understand and evaluate the events which led to the eventual establishment of the two separate states of India and Pakistan. Subsequent research required for the preparation of the book was financed by the Rockefeller Foundation. The work follows with strict chronological sequence and meticulous detail the series of events which led to final independence. Most valuable to the readers are the twelve separate appendices of original statements of the major figures who were involved in this constitutional development, including those of L. S. Amery, Secretary of State for India, Sir Stafford Cripps, and Prime Minister Attlee. In addition, there is an adequate bibliography of source materials.

Myron Weiner's relatively short work, published for the Center of International Studies at Princeton University, is a remarkable study of the political parties currently existing in India. Mr. Weiner introduces his subject with a keen analysis of the major problems which must be solved if the democratic system is to be successful in India. Lack of opportunity for the educated class, the social ostracism which too often results from education, and the economic frustration which education creates are all lucidly treated. The author recognizes the danger to evolutional democracy in a country in which the vast majority of the population is both ignorant of and uninterested in the democratic processes of government; moreover, he explains the serious dangers to democracy in an area which possesses only one major party (the Congress Party) and several definitely minor opposition parties. The chief political parties—Congress, Praja Socialist, Jan Sangh Hindu, Communist, and the Socialist

are each treated separately. In the presentation of each Mr. Weiner outlines its historic background, evolution, and principal policies presently advocated and analyses the political strength, ideology, and program of each, estimating as well the probability of mergers between the various parties. This work is an extremely valuable contribution to the understanding of the problems attendant on the development of democracy in modern India, and should not be ignored by any student of Indian affairs. The work closes with an excellent comprehensive bibliography of twenty pages on the "General Books and Articles" available for consultation.

LEWIS B. CLINGMAN

Aquinas College
Grand Rapids

MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

Matthew Paris. By Richard Vaughan. [Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought. New Series: Volume 6.] (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1958. Pp. xii, 287. $7.50.)

Matthew Paris (c. 1200-1259) has long been recognized as an important and prolific chronicler of St. Albans. Although his works have been edited, and the more important ones translated into English and French, there has been no over-all scholarly evaluation of the man nor such an able study of the manuscript tradition as this one. Nothing is known of the life of this cloistered Benedictine of St. Albans prior to 1247. Even his family background and nationality are unknown. The author believes he was English; certainly his outlook was. The personality of Matthew, which has to be deduced from his writings, emerges as that of a crusty, embittered gossip full of prejudices—a cantankerous thirteenth-century Tory chauvinist who was constantly complaining about taxes and papal and royal authority. "A humbug and a hypocrite . . . he deplored the splendours of the world yet revelled in them . . . on friendly terms with the king yet he never ceased to slander him." But he had a robust sense of humor and an insatiable curiosity which made him a close observer of detail. A gifted writer and accomplished scandalmonger, his style is vivid, colorful, and dramatic. He is "one of the handful of medieval writers whose works can be appreciated and enjoyed today."

As an historian Matthew is "of little significance." Inaccurate, careless, repetitive he does not hesitate to falsify documents deliberately. Uninterested in the abstract, in the deeper meaning of the issues of papal relations with England—or even of English "constitutionalism"—Matthew's hostility to the papacy and to the crown is more the result of prejudice than

considered reflection on the legitimate functions of each. His major work, the *Chronica majora,* is the fullest and most detailed of all mediaeval chronicles. It is particularly interesting for its description of the foibles and prejudices of the man in the street. Yet it was virtually unknown outside of St. Albans during the late Middle Ages. Actually Matthew's *Flores historiarum* was the only one of his works which was widely used in mediaeval times. In his last years Matthew began to expurgate his *Chronica majora* and his *Historia Anglorum* by pasting over the most offensive passages pieces of vellum with toned down versions. Vaughan believes this was done rather as a result of a guilty conscience than because a copy of his autograph was to be made for someone outside of St. Albans.

Vaughan reviews the controversies over the authenticity of the *Abbreviatio chronicorum,* the *Flores historiarum,* and the *Vitae abbatum* and confirms or proves that these were all written by Matthew. In fact, we have his autograph of the *Chronica majora* from 1213 on. From 1245 on it was written only a year or two after the events described took place. Other works which have survived in Matthew's autograph are: the *Historia Anglorum,* an abridgment of the *Chronica majora* written between 1250-1255, the *Flores historiarum* for the years 1241-1249, the *Liber additamentorum*—a collection of documents which Matthew assembled in an appendix rather than incorporate in his chronicle, and the *Abbreviatio chronicorum* which is an abridgment of the *Historia Anglorum.*

The author rounds out his study with chapters on Matthew as hagiologist, artist, cartographer, and heraldist. His chronicle was the first illustrated record of contemporary events to be produced in mediaeval England. His style was typical of twelfth and thirteenth-century monastic art and does not seem to have had much influence. Matthew's maps of England, Scotland, and Palestine, however, are "landmarks in the history of cartography." Vaughan's excellent study of "the first recognizable personification of John Bull" is done with the care and competence characteristic of the series in which it appears.

JAMES A. CORBETT

University of Notre Dame

The Life of Edward the Second. By the So-called Monk of Malmesbury. Translated and edited by N. Denholm-Young. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1957. Pp. xxviii, 150. $4.00.)

The *Life of Edward the Second,* done into English by N. Denholm-Young, continues the series of translations known as Nelson's Medieval Texts. Mr. Denholm-Young's translation accompanies the text of the

Vita, newly edited by him from Thomas Hearne's transcript in 1729 of a fourteenth-century manuscript lost by fire in 1737. The translator is apparently qualified for his task, having studied extensively the problems of authenticity presented by the *Vita Edwardi Secundi* [cf. "The Authorship of *Vita Edwardi Secundi*," *English Historical Review,* LXXI (April, 1956), 189-211]. To this preliminary essay the introduction to the present volume adds not at all, since it appears to be only a somewhat shortened version without benefit of the previous work's copious documentation. The introduction, nevertheless, discusses with great insight the relationship of the text to Edward's reign, its sources and date, and its conjectural author. Professor Denholm-Young, agreeing with Stubbs that the author was no monk, seems somewhat extreme in postulating that Mr. John Walwayn—one-time king's clerk and in all respects a likely candidate—"was one of us." Whatever might be suggested by this expression, it should not be interpreted, as well it might, to imply that the author of the *Vita* was a layman. Frank Pegues' fine study ["The *Clericus* in the Legal Administration of Thirteenth-Century England," *English Historical Review,* LXXI (October, 1956), 529-559] makes it clear that in the thirteenth century most king's clerks were clerics in minor orders. This generalization holds also for the author of the *Life of Edward the Second.* On seven distinct occasions (pp. 40, 41, 47, 57, 77, 78, 99) his clerical orientation reveals itself with unmistakable clarity. Even the "diatribe against the venality of the papal court at Avignon" (pp. 45-48) could have been written only by a cleric and, incidentally, only by an Englishman who was something of a fourteenth-century Giraldus Cambrensis. A text, moreover, so laden with references to the Psalms, could have been produced only by one who had daily recited the canonical hours.

The translator, generally precise and felicitous in rendering narrative, legal, and constitutional Latin, leaves much to be desired when ecclesiastical situations are involved. Scriptural quotations and allusions, particularly from the Old Testament, are identified with some assurance (although Pharoah [*sic*], in the *Book of Numbers* (p. 77), could scarcely have exempted the tribe of Levi from civil service; nor would the levitical order have been subject to the jurisdiction of the supreme pontiff!). The resolution of New Testament references, however, is most inadequate. The editor-translator's failure to recognize New Testament overtones is so serious, that his competence to judge the character of the author might well be called in question.

Some shortcomings in translation should be noted: *Anglicana religio* (p. 64) should probably be rendered "religious orders of England," rather than "English church"; for *iure cauetur* (p. 62) read "is provided by law," not "the law warns us"; for *diuina celebrare* (p. 89) read "celebrate divine services (the Mass)," not "holy offices"; for *questionibus addictum* (p.

95) read "put to torture," not "put to the question"; *religiosi* (p. 96) is translated into "religious," or "regulars," not "men of religion." *Timendum est itaque prelatis* (p. 106) should read "we must therefore fear for such prelates," not "they should be alarmed"; *spes salutis* (p. 107) is "hope of salvation," not "hope of safety"; *elemosinarum nomine* (p. 127) is "as an alms," not "in the name of Alms"; *oretenus* (p. 111) is "orally," not "kissing"; and *inuito domino* (p. 127) is "without consent of the owner," not "of the lord." These observations aside, the translation is generally competent, at times even brilliant. It tends to demonstrate once again the wisdom and honesty of the editor's policy to publish translations *vis-à-vis* their original texts.

OWEN J. BLUM

Quincy College

Traité d'Emmanuel Piloti sur le passage en Terre Sainte (1420). Edited by Pierre-Herman Dopp. [Publications de l'Université Lovanium de Léopoldville, 4.] (Louvain: Editions E. Nauwelaerts; Paris: Béatrice-Nauwelaerts, 1958. Pp. l, 302. 390 frs. b.)

Emmanuel Piloti, Cretan by birth, Venetian by citizenship, active merchant for over forty years, adviser to popes, propagandist for and would-be organizer of crusades, ranks as one of the best-informed western observers of Mameluke Egypt of the early fifteenth century, in which country he lived for no less than twenty-two years. His treatise, preserved only in a single manuscript, a French translation made in 1441 from the apparently lost Latin original, was first published in a somewhat faulty and now hard-to-come-by edition in 1846 by Baron de Reiffenberg. Piloti's work is weighted with so much information concerning Egyptian commerce as virtually to constitute a merchant's handbook, even richer in regard to the Levant than Pegolotti's classic of the century before, and was effectively utilized by Wilhelm Heyd in his ground-breaking studies of Levantese commerce. Piloti's recognized importance for the history of the later crusades and for economic history, his obvious though not yet fully exploited value for the history of Mameluke Egypt, amply justify Dopp's decision to prepare this new edition. Readers of the treatise will find, too, that Piloti (over seventy by the time he finished his work) is an outspoken commentator upon and critic of western conditions as well, at least those affecting the preparations for and outcome of his cherished crusade.

In this treatise addressed to Pope Eugene IV he is strongly critical of the papal curia, and contrasts its finances and politics with what we are given to believe were the idyllic conditions of the sultan's court at

Cairo. His plan for a world government, based on the maintenance at Rome of permanent embassies from the western princes, is an interesting application of the institution of the Italian commercial consulate to European diplomatic relations. His plan for utilizing the economic potential of the port of Alexandria, once taken by the crusaders, to weaken the infidel and liberate the Holy Land contains not only an analysis of trade relations in the Levant but should interest, too, any student of the germinating mercantilistic ideas of the late Middle Ages. Piloti, in brief, has put together a colorful parade of observations, ideas, and schemes. He ranges in subject from bananas to incubators. He betrays that characteristic mixture, that easy juxtaposition, of the sacred and profane (the crusade should be undertaken "for the soul's devotion, and in order to be able to buy and sell") that suggests that the tension between the mediaeval Christian ethic and the business life was something felt more keenly by modern scholars than by mediaeval merchants. He makes delightful reading. Dopp has graced Piloti's rambling text and exotic vocabulary with erudite footnotes, and has added a bibliography, glossary, and index. The footnotes, however, seem to have been proof-read only casually. Then, too, in a treatise so much concerned with commerce and military strategy I greatly missed a map.

DAVID HERLIHY

Bryn Mawr College

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Portgugal and the Portuguese World. By Richard Pattee. (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1957. Pp. vi, 350. $7.50.)

With few exceptions histories of Portugal written by Portuguese since the last years of the eighteenth century have been noted for their bias. The unfortunate and seemingly insoluble division in Portuguese political life is reflected in what should be scientific writing. Non-Portuguese, especially British and Americans, have been relatively free of the deliberate writing of prejudiced history. In recent years, Livermore and Nowell are examples of this objectivity. In this volume, in which almost half the space is devoted to the period since 1926 and to the empire, there is an abrupt departure from Livermore and Nowell. To say that it shows bias would be to understate the case. Throughout Mr. Pattee has chosen sides, has played a game of "cops and robbers." Those whom he likes, conservatives consistently, are within the stream of Portuguese tradition, those whom he dislikes are not. Once the latter part of the eighteenth century is begun, the lines are clearly drawn, the historical facts and personalities are bent to suit the author's scheme, which is to present a war of the

forces of light and darkness, culminating in the triumph of the former with the establishment of Dr. Salazar's régime. There is something to be said for the author's point of view. but history is more complex than Mr. Pattee sees it. Stripped of its scholarly apparatus, this work would have been a clever journalistic effort written for a naive and shallowly pious audience.

It would appear, however, that Mr. Pattee has appealed to a higher audience, for scholarship seems to be apparent in the many quotations, the citations, and the extensive bibliography. It is on the score of scholarship that the propaganda edifice is destroyed. The limitations of space make it impossible to discuss the many ideological half truths or even the peculiar and obtrusive pro-Spanish bias, but one can list a *few* of the distortions and omissions. Martim Afonso de Sousa arrives in Brazil in 1534 (p. 117); there is no mention of the inadequate preparation of Dom Sebastião's expedition (p. 132); Philip II's pretensions are solidly based (p. 133) but Catherine "probably had better legal claims" than Philip (p. 134); Engel Sluiter's well known thesis on the effect of the Spanish usurpation is overlooked (p. 136); Bombay is not mentioned in the Marriage Treaty with Britain (p. 142); the suppression of the Jesuits takes place in 1767 (p. 52); Évora is ignored as a Jesuit university (p. 153); the War of the Oranges becomes a crushing defeat (p. 157); Olivença is not guaranteed to Portugal by Vienna (p. 163); the 1818 [*sic*] conspiracy was successful (p. 163); Don Carlos of Spain is the son of Dom João and Carlota Joaquina (p. 166); Dona Maria de Glória is supreme in 1832 (p. 169); Fernandes Tomás, who died in 1822, is influenced in 1817 by a Bolivarian constitution of either 1817 or 1825—which is not made clear—but in the context of 1821 (p. 174).

One could go on with the sad chronology of errors. Evidently the book was hastily written. But what is to be said about the lifting of footnote 57, page 164, citing Luz Soriano from Damião Peres, *História de Portugal* [VII, 44] without credit? It is regrettable that the author did not read Soriano, for in this instance the whole passage, here found in truncated form, would have or should have tempered the approach. This and further oddities lead one to believe that the bibliography displayed was never used. That the author does not use recent revised editions, e.g., Gama Barros, or critical editions, e.g., Rui de Pina, and favors popular books (Ley) over the authoritative (Greenlee) creates further suspicion.

In short the book is extremely unfortunate. It has done a disservice to the reader, to the publisher, and chiefly and ironically to the cause which Mr. Pattee has previously served so long and so well.

GEORGE C. A. BOEHRER

Georgetown University

Doctor Rabelais. By D. B. Wyndham Lewis. (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1957. Pp. 274. $4.00.)

Wyndham Lewis has dug an airy tunnel beneath the pedantic walls in which the savants have imprisoned Rabelais so long. And once on the other side, Mr. Lewis brings off the further triumph of returning Rabelais' wink—slyly and convincingly. Lewis is not only Rabelais' liberator but even at times his literary match, through that zest for language which recently led T. S. Eliot to describe him as "the greatest prose master of my generation." However, in sapping the defenses of the erudite, Mr. Lewis works as one who has studied them closely. Moreover, for each allusion to "academic vultures" who claw "my beloved doctor," or to "the groans of learned men struggling to reduce Doctor Rabelais' system of cerebration to a formula," Lewis pays ungrudging honor to those "respectable authorities" whose labors he admires. For this reason, Lewis' *Rabelais,* informed by what he calls his own "long, strong, enduring affection for one of the comic geniuses of all time," is not entirely a work of demolition or the wholly new departure which he represents the book to be in the introduction.

In the spirit of his hero, Lewis is seldom a slave to consistency. Although less solemn than the academic experts about the question of "how to read Rabelais," Lewis concedes each element of the Rabelais enigma through the body of the book, while insisting at the beginning and the end that Rabelais should be treated as an entertainer and read for entertainment. Just as "the truth about the Doctor is still anybody's guess," Lewis suggests here that Rabelais was "only nominally a professing Catholic" (p. 10), there that he was "censurable but not excommunicable" (pp. 137 f.), and elsewhere that Rabelais exercised a subtle restraint which preserved his orthodoxy intact, in spite of his attacks on "Catholic theologians and practices, the monastic system, the temporal power of the Holy See, and one or two Popes in person" (p. 80). Rabelais again has eluded the categories of his interpreters, and Mr. Lewis, like the rest of us, falls victim to the doctor's skill in tangling up his readers in his own (and their own) contradictions.

It would be captious to tax Lewis for his willingness to reify the Renaissance into an outsize Pantagruel, or to find fault with him for careless generalization about both sides of the religious controversy. Although chronically uncertain about whether to try to "explain" the behavior of one he describes so deftly, Mr. Lewis has made Rabelais delightfully accessible in this biographical essay on the enigma of Chinon.

RICHARD M. DOUGLAS

Amherst College

The Day They Killed the King. By Hugh Ross Williamson. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1957. Pp. 206. $3.75.)

In the narration of the career of a public man there is usually reserved a special chapter or section to describe the manner in which the protagonist met his death. The deeds and misdeeds of a lifetime lose something of their relevance once the attention has been focused upon that final dread moment. The glee, e.g., with which Mr. Belloc described Thomas Cromwell being dragged kicking to the scaffold did not suggest a failure to recognize a life filled with mighty accomplishments, any more than the sober Professor Pollard, in observing that Mary Stuart met "the supreme test with splendid courage," meant thereby to mollify his grave reservations about the Queen of Scots' character.

To isolate, then, the day upon which King Charles I was beheaded, as Mr. Ross Williamson does in this admirable little book, and to attempt "for the first time," as he writes in his preface, "to make a concerted chronicle of the whole day, as far as any evidence is ascertainable," makes of him neither a Roundhead nor a Cavalier. His detached and yet compassionate chronicle begins with "The Prologue to the Day," in which we witness the king's showpiece trial and his touching farewell to his two small children. "The Day" itself, January 30, 1649, "so bitter that the Thames was frozen over," began for Charles at 5:30 in the morning, and Mr. Ross Williamson leads us from the king's "long, careful toilet" to the moment in the early afternoon when the assistant to the executioner threw "Charles's head down on the scaffold with such violence that the still-warm cheek was badly bruised." In "The Epilogue to the Day," finally, we are told of the complications of the king's funeral, and we are reminded, in the details of the fate of one of the regicides in 1660, that seldom in a dispute do brutality and injustice lie all on one side.

All this Mr. Ross Williamson tells with a genuine feeling for persons and places. Charles, of course, with his great dignity and courage, holds the center of the stage, a small man suddenly invested with heroic stature, while Cromwell spends most of the time in the wings, bullying his more timid associates into an acceptance of his decision. There are besides a dozen other persons whom this day touched deeply in one way or another, and all of them emerge as real and vital and credible human beings. One might well regret the author's decision neither to cite nor to differentiate the sources he uses with such skill, a decision which stems, I suppose, from his conviction that ". . . academic history, when it is not the lowest form of fiction, is only the raw material from which the literary artist may fashion something more nearly corresponding to 'the truth' than is possible for the mere scholastic." However that may be, Mr. Ross Williamson has

given us an absorbing account of a day which had momentous consequences, and not only for Charles Stuart.

MARVIN R. O'CONNELL

University of Notre Dame

The New Cambridge Modern History. Volume VII. *The Old Regime 1713-63.* Edited by J. O. Lindsay. (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1957. Pp. xx, 625. $7.50.)

The first volume of the original *Cambridge Modern History* came out in 1902. This new collaborative work scheduled for fourteen volumes comes out then just about a half a century later; it must necessarily include much its predecessor could not. In scope and in general character the new undertaking is clearly a legitimate descendant of the original one. Each separate volume now has an editor who will work within the plans set up by Sir George Clark and an advisory board. By this device, the delays that are the curse of these collaborative ventures may be somewhat shortened. This volume at least is written wholly by British experts; the original Cambridge *History* had many collaborators from the continent and from the United States. There is in this volume a definite recognition of the change in emphasis among historians which was being christened, though hardly invented, by James Harvey Robinson at just about the time the original work came out—the "new history." The first nine chapters deal not with separate countries but with the western world, and not with political but with social, economic, and intellectual history, and with war and international politics seen in their broad frame of general reference. The last fourteen chapters do, indeed, break the account down by national units in the usual way, but their attention to areas outside western Europe is much greater than in the original work. On the whole, the present editor, Mr. J. O. Lindsay, has managed to avoid the duplication such a scheme threatens to produce. It need hardly be said that all the collaborators are competent men in their fields, and that they are fully aware of the important contributions made in the last fifty years. The inevitable remark about unevenness can be greatly softened; the level of writing is high throughout.

Yet not even the lover of the century of the Enlightenment is going to *enjoy* reading this book. It is about time that the professional historian faced the fact: collaborative works on this scale in history, with many contributors doing relatively short pieces, are works of reference, and nothing more. They are a kind of first processing—most useful, indeed, in these days most necessary—of the raw materials of history. They are not history for the ultimate consumer, any more than a bolt of cloth is a

garment fit for wearing. Why this should be so is not altogether clear. Conventional explanations drawn from critical literary standards are no doubt largely adequate: the best editor cannot produce unity out of so many minds and styles, especially in these days of multanimity. Our age is impatient enough with any *oeuvre de longue haleine,* and not without reason, as Professor Marcus Cunliffe has recently remarked in the *Reporter* (February 20, 1958) in a review of the seven-volume work by the late Douglas S. Freeman on George Washington. For here the commonplace is wholly relevant: there just is too much to read, too much to master. Only a great historian can stand the test of lengthiness; and there never has yet been a great historian synthetized out of collaborating experts.

Seen as a work of reference, however, the new enterprise, if it can be judged by this volume, deserves to take its place on any major library shelf. It is well indexed and has a good working analytical table of contents. The planning committee clearly made a decision to postpone for two separate volumes, a thirteenth labelled "Companion to Modern History" and a fourteenth "Atlas," those very essential elements of a good work of historical reference, bibliographies, and maps. The separate volume for the atlas was no doubt the only possible solution in view of the great cost of such work; but it may be questioned whether the editors were wise in excluding bibliographies from the individual volumes. One of the great strengths of the original *Cambridge Modern History* was its bibliographies, and it is to be doubted if the proposed "Companion," even if it comes out on time, can really do the needed work. Certainly in this volume the footnoting does not make up for the lack, for the great majority of the chapters have no footnotes, or only very occasional ones.

CRANE BRINTON

Harvard University

English Historical Documents. Volume X. *1714-1783.* Edited by David Bayne Horn and Mary Ransome. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1957. Pp. xxvii, 972. $15.20.)

Students of English history have been sensible of their obligation to Mr. David Douglas and his fellow editors of *English Historical Documents* since the first volume of this fine series appeared in 1953. The latest contribution of Mr. Horn and Miss Ransome will be welcomed particularly by those scholars whose interest is focused on the early Hanoverian period. The editors have selected a *corpus* of documents designed to illuminate the constitutional, legal, political, diplomatic, economic, and military history of eighteenth-century England. In addition

there are short but adequate sections on Scotland, Ireland, and the empire, although the last only supplements the generous treatment accorded colonial affairs in the preceding volume of the series.

There is a phenomenal range and variety of documents, drawn from numerous printed sources, many of which are not commonly found in smaller college and university libraries. Statutes, treaties, official reports, and parliamentary debates are given generous quotation, as well as correspondence, memoirs, and other unofficial sources. It would increase the interest of this series, especially for the younger student, if there could be included a selection of unpublished sources; a sampling from the mine of manuscript material lately made available to eighteenth-century scholarship would have enriched the present volume. Understandably, however, the editors have not attempted to include documents from manuscript collections; for this would have complicated their task and made an already large volume more unwieldy.

The major themes and problems of the period have been admirably surveyed in a sixty-five page general introduction and in the short essays preceding each group of documents. The writer of epitomes always risks over-simplification and inexact generalization, and Mr. Horn and Miss Ransome have not entirely avoided these snares. It is puzzling, e.g., to read of the Rockingham Whigs emerging during this period as a party "which unequivocally asserted the sovereignty of the people," an observation the editors might more aptly apply to John Wilkes and his adherents, whose activities they note in a succeeding paragraph. It is also astonishing to read that the eighteenth century has little to offer the political historian (p. 64). One might correctly attribute more far-reaching constitutional developments to the seventeenth century, and observe more urgent economic movements in the nineteenth, but the century of Bolingbroke, Walpole, and Burke is an age of most absorbing political incident. The editors are surely mistaken in their statement that debt charges between 1714 and 1783 rose from two and a half millions to fourteen millions (p. 15). The figures which they cite earlier in this paragraph clearly indicate that the charges for 1714 should be about six millions.

It would be difficult, if not ungracious, for a critic to complain of any significant omissions in this altogether satisfactory anthology. The treatment accorded the Catholics is brief, though probably adequate in proportion to the total scale of the volume; yet one would appreciate more on the clergy and Catholic nobles, and some indication of the distribution of Catholics in the population. The section on social history might also have been amplified, e.g., material on theaters, music, and popular pastimes is wanting, while additional items on architecture, gardening, and travel would be of interest. The bibliographies are excellent, and there are service-

able maps. lists of principal office holders, and genealogical tables. There is an index of texts, but the lack of a general index will impair the usefulness of an otherwise invaluable sourcebook.

JAMES E. BUNCE

St. John's University
New York

Burke and the Nature of Politics: The Age of the American Revolution. By Carl B. Cone. (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press. 1957. Pp. xv, 415. $9.00.)

An important school of thought among Burke scholars holds that it is unwise to write a biography until the scholarly edition of Burke's correspondence now underway has been completed and until definitive studies of special aspects of Burke's career have been published. Professor Cone has courageously and wisely challenged that position. Possessed of advantages in the matter of materials which no previous biographer has employed, Sir Philip Magnus included, he has employed them most effectively. He has, in fact, used every source of manuscript material with which I am acquainted.

In this first of a projected two-volume study Burke's career is traced down to 1782 when he stood on the threshold of resuming office, albeit very briefly, after sixteen long years of opposition. Mr. Cone's thesis, which he convincingly sustains, is that Burke was more of a politician and a party man during the years covered in this volume than he was a systematic political philosopher. Particular stress is placed on showing how Burke demonstrated the role of political parties as vitally necessary components in the process of free government. Customarily thought of as an arch-conservative, Burke emerges from these pages as one who in reality did far more than the political radicals to revolutionize the actual operation of England's political and constitutional system. Meticulously documented and gracefully written, this is incomparably the best biography of Burke yet to appear. Mr. Cone has, indeed, achieved a remarkable *tour de force* which doubtless will lend encouragement to others who will see in it profitable new areas to investigate.

In truth so admirable a performance has been accomplished that any criticism is in danger of appearing captious. With that risk in mind, however, there are a couple of matters which seem to me necessitate some comment. E.g., the statement that Burke's inability to block the bill augmenting the forces in Ireland in 1768 was "the earliest of many discouragements in trying to help his native land" (p. 165) overlooks the fact that Burke was behind the unsuccessful attempt made by Hamilton in

the 1761-1762 session of the Irish Parliament to raise six regiments of Catholics for service in Portugal. Furthermore, the statement that "Clearly, Burke had no vision of the kind of home rule based upon legislative independence that later generations came to practice . . ." (p. 167) is debatable. It can be argued that before the grant of "legislative independence" to Grattan's parliament in 1782 this statement is valid but certainly not afterward. Burke was opposed to the grant, as Professor Cone rightly notes, but once it became a *fait accompli* he accepted it, although he thought it was too loose to be really viable. His efforts after 1782 as they applied to Ireland aimed at the reformation of the Irish Parliament by restoring the Catholics first to their franchise and then to their seats, and he also sought to break the power of the Protestant Ascendancy. An Irish Parliament featured by the return of the Catholics and by the removal of the power of the Ascendancy would be competent to direct its own affairs within the kind of limitations inherently involved in home rule as it later came to be advocated.

The concluding volume might be made even more appealing (although admittedly this will be difficult since the present one is so excellent) by a more liberal use of the contemporary press. Too much emphasis upon a single newspaper (the *Daily Advertiser*) is obvious. Finally, while an admirable number of the caricatures of James Sayers has been included, some additional material of this kind in the form of political cartoons involving Burke might well have been employed as visual evidence of the kind of abuse to which Burke was ever subjected.

THOMAS H. D. MAHONEY

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Allied Wartime Diplomacy: A Pattern in Poland. By Eduard J. Rozek. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1958. Pp. xiii, 487. $6.95.)

The author, a professor of political science in the University of Colorado, discusses in eight chapters the allied wartime diplomacy regarding Poland. After formulating the main points of strategy and tactics of Soviet foreign policy, he presents the background of Soviet-Polish relations from 1917 to 1939, the fate of Poland after the outbreak of World War II, the rather precarious alliance of Poland with the Soviet Union after the attack of Hitler against the East up to the rupture of the diplomatic relations because of the Katyn mass murder. There then follows the establishment of the Lublin Committee by Stalin, its transformation into the provisional government, its recognition as a "Provisional Government of National Unity" by the allies, and finally the Potsdam Conference and

the "elections" in Poland. In addition there are the conclusions, five appendices, bibliography, and index.

The book is based on extensive primary sources, on the full text of private notes and official records of diplomatic conferences, and besides on confidential letters and diplomatic reports and on the rich material of "Official Government Documents of Poland" from the archives of Stanislav Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland, including his oral comments and explanations. The work is a model of careful and precise research, fully documented, and constitutes a really outstanding contribution to the wartime history of the tragedy of the Polish nation itself and of the western Ukrainians and Byelo-Ruthenians (Byelo-Russians) who as considerable ethnographic minorities inhabited the eastern territories of the Polish Republic.

Some background information merits comment. Dr. Rozek states concerning the year 1918 that "In the meantime a fluid and chaotic condition prevailed in the western territories of the Soviet Union" (p. 10). But the Soviet Union came into existence in 1922-1924 (ratification of the Soviet Union constitution). On May 6, 1920, Polish legions did not reach Kiev (p. 11), but rather the allied Polish-Ukrainian armies. The author also says, "prior to launching of his offensive, Pilsudski reached an agreement with the Ukrainian leader, Petlura, which signified a future union of Poland and the Ukraine." But the facts are: (a) the agreement was concluded between the Polish Republic and the Ukrainian National Republic on April 21, 1920, in Warsaw and (b) no future union of Poland and Ukraine was planned or discussed. The documents of this period are published and must be taken into consideration. The official Polish statistics regarding the minorities were not reliable. In spite of the rather unfortunate Polish policy regarding the minorities, the vice-speaker of the Polish Diet, Wasyl Mudry, the leader of the largest Ukrainian Democratic Party (Undo) proclaimed at the beginning of World War II the loyalty of Ukrainians to the Polish Republic, appealing to them to defend it. Thus the Ukrainians and also the Byelo-Ruthenians of the Polish Republic joined the allied cause, and the rape of Poland committed, with the consent of Poland's allies, includes not only the violation of the fundamental rights of the Poles, but also of the western Ukrainians and western Byelo-Ruthenians, who, contrary to all principles of self-determination, were integrated by fake elections into the Ukrainian and Byelo-Russian Socialist Soviet Republics, where their Catholic and Orthodox Churches were brutally liquidated.

The book's preface by Professor William Y. Elliot of Harvard includes some moral and political evaluations of the facts presented in Rozek's work. Only students of eastern European affairs who disclaim any ethical

judgment on politics will not suffer a shock after reading this book because facts prove the leading statesmen of the West decided basic European problems from a short range opportunistic point of view, disregarding all principles of law and morality. This work is the beginning of an agonizing reappraisal of the statesmanship of Churchill, and in the second line of Roosevelt, who not only were the gravediggers of the liberty of Poland, of the relative liberty of the western Ukrainians and Byelo-Ruthenians, but also of the Baltic States and Czecho-Slovakia whose independence was based on Poland's independence. This pattern of allied diplomacy was applied also to Yugoslavia and China and it is responsible for the present protracted world crisis.

ROMAN SMAL-STOCKI

Marquette University

Soviet Diplomacy and the Spanish Civil War. By David T. Cattell. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1957. Pp. x, 204. $2.00 paper; $3.00 cloth.)

This volume, supplementary to the author's previous essay on *Communism and the Spanish Civil War,* presents several debatable theses: (1) that the Soviet purpose was "to strengthen her relations with England and France and to defend herself against German aggression"; (2) that the stimulus for Soviet action "was, of course, the continued support of the rebels by Italy and Germany"; (3) that the policy of appeasement by the British, and through them perforce by the French, "influenced the change in Soviet policy in the spring of 1939 and opened the way to the Russo-German pact of August 1939." Mr. Cattell is obviously familiar with Russian, and to buttress his theses he relies extensively on Russian newspapers and pamphlets. I wonder, however, if his apparent scholarship is not lop-sided, and actually, though unconsciously, misleading. At any rate, he acknowledges a lack of primary material on the attitude and real intentions of Stalin and the other Soviet leaders.

Yet the author makes a number of judgments and conclusions as favorable to Moscow as they are critical of London. From the available data, I should think that certain theses, quite at variance with his, could be more reasonably and more fairly maintained: (1) that the Soviet purpose was to exploit the difficulties of the Spanish Republic, and particularly the Nationalist revolt, in order to install a Communist satellite in the strategic Iberian peninsula, and to this end it played a "popular-front" game in the 1930's similar to what it played in 1945-1946 in east-central Europe; (2) that Soviet action needed no stimulus from Italy and Germany, for from the outset it fostered the recruitment and arming of

the international brigades, steadily supplied or induced France to supply Spain's "popular-front" government with military equipment and advisors, and by the spring of 1937 was ousting its opponent, Largo Caballero, and promoting its henchmen, Alvarez del Vayo and Negrin, thereby ensuring Soviet dominance of the Spanish Republic, and, no less than Germany and Italy, it flaunted the international non-intervention agreement; (3) that the British government, becoming aware of what the Soviet was up to in Spain, naturally grew distrustful of the possibility of any honest co-operation with it and at last sought, mistakenly as we now see, an appeasement of Germany; (4) that Stalin, failing to obtain a satellite in western Europe, sought through his pact of August, 1939, with Hitler—and secured—compensatory satellites in eastern Europe.

I suppose the issue will be debated for years to come. Mr. Cattell has presented one side of it. It is a popular but very partisan side. He has bolstered it as well as any one can.

CARLTON J. H. HAYES

Jericho Farm
Afton, New York

AMERICAN HISTORY

The American Idea of Mission. Concepts of National Purpose and Destiny. By Edward McNall Burns. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1957. Pp. xii, 385. $9.00.)

A few years ago the Carnegie Corporation issued a report, *Who Knows America?*, which led to the obvious conclusion that nobody knows. To rectify this ignorance is the purpose of this book. By drawing on his extensive experience in the study and teaching of American thought, Professor Burns has produced a very good work—provocative, well-written, and of such general interest that it should not be restricted to specialists. The main theme is that an important avenue to an understanding of this country lies in the American ideal of mission, which runs like a thread through most of American history. To the author, this sense of mission has been more of a hindrance to cultured development than an asset, for it fostered worship of the past which, in turn, helps explain the basic conservatism of Americans and their lack of originality. In every period of American history this idea pervaded the writings of critical philosophers, distinguished historians, and social scientists. Our national heritage and geographic factors assisted the development of this sense of mission.

The author considers the following as the basic elements in the American myth of purpose and destiny. "First: It is our duty to proclaim liberty

throughout the world. . . . Second: The glory of America is to set an example of equality to all nations. . . . Third: America is the home of the truest and most complete democracy to be found in the world. . . . Fourth: America is the most peaceful and non-militaristic of the leading nations. . . . Fifth: America is the exemplar of the highest standard of living the world has ever known." In the concluding chapter Burns' critical evaluation of the various conceptions which make up the American mission reveals that none has actually been realized in practice, except for the goal of a standard of living unparalleled anywhere else in the world. In spite of these criticisms the mission of the United States "remains one of the noblest expressions of idealism that any nation has embraced." But for America to be an inspiration to men forever, Americans must practice their proclaimed ideals.

To develop his thesis and its basic components the author has drawn on the thoughts of great Americans from colonial times to the present. His selection of expositors of the American ideals is fairly comprehensive and objective. Some objection might be raised as to the over-reliance on figures of lesser importance like David Starr Jordan. The material is not only for illustrative purposes, but for analytical and critical development of the propositions. Obvious discrepancies, too often overlooked, are clearly indicated. Logical organization is a strength of the book, and excellent summaries appear at the end of each chapter. Out of this volume one can obtain the meaning of America as formed in the crucible of American experience. The progression or regression of the basic concepts in various historical periods are differentiated. To the author this book provides, in part, a vehicle for the expression of strong personal views which will arouse both admiration and severe indictment. Catholics may be shocked to learn that this nation is an Old Testament people, which accounts for the vigor and pervasiveness of the Puritan influence. This book should be a valuable addition to the others which have appeared in recent years with the express purpose of providing more insights into, and understanding of, the meaning of America.

ANTHONY F. TURHOLLOW

Loyola University of Los Angeles

American Judaism. By Nathan Glazer. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1957. Pp. xi, 175. $3.50.)

A companion of Monsignor Ellis' *American Catholicism* in the Chicago History of American Civilization series, this well-written study by a former editor of *Commentary* and co-author of *The Lonely Crowd* traces the history of Jews in the United States from its beginnings to the present day.

The early Jewish settlers were in the main traders and merchants, Spanish and Portuguese Jews, who came to these shores, a few at a time, by way of Brazil, the Caribbean Islands, Holland, and England, or directly from the Iberian Peninsula in the second half of the seventeenth century. In those days, the Jewish community grew but slowly. Later it increased notably, even rapidly, through mass immigration, the movement of groups of families from the same town or region. The first such movement, between 1836 and 1880, was that of German Jews, many of whom were poor and had to start their American adventure as peddlers in cities and rural areas. Quite a few left the eastern seaboard to earn their livelihood in the South, Midwest, or Far West; often they were among the first inhabitants of towns. From approximately 15,000 in 1840 the number of Jews grew to about 250,000 in 1880, most of them of central European background. Following the Russian pogroms and anti-Jewish decrees, there were new waves of poor immigrants, this time from eastern Europe. By 1900 half a million, by 1914 another million and a quarter had entered the country; by 1927, eighty per cent or more of the Jewish community was of eastern European origin.

Hand in hand with the change of pace and character of Jewish immigration went a change of the social, cultural, and religious structure of the American Jewish community. Ruled at first by what Mr. Glazer calls "dignified orthodoxy," it was at the time of the influx of German Jews dominated by the Reform movement; with the arrival of eastern European Jews, Conservatism and secularism in its several forms became important factors in its life. Today the Jewish community experiences a revival, a return to the synagogue, but to the synagogue as a social, rather than a religious, center.

Mr. Glazer's book is of refreshing honesty. He sees the two conflicting desires of American Jews—one, to be an integral part of American society, the other, to remain apart—as one of the major dilemmas of American Judaism. He gently corrects those who proclaim Judaism as the ideal religion for modern man, who no longer lives for salvation but for life on this earth: "There are Jewish thinkers fond of pointing to the fact that Judaism has always emphasized this life rather than the life beyond the grave, as if to suggest that this puts Judaism in a better position than Christianity in the modern world. But in so doing they deceive themselves. Judaism governed all the minutiae of life, not to enhance it in the way in which contemporary men wish to enhance it, but to fulfill the word of God" (p. 10). To him the most significant religious reality among American Jews is that they have not ceased being Jews; they have not altogether cast off the burden of the Jewish heritage, even though often they cannot tell what it is. Dead in one generation, Jewish tradition may come

to life again in another. But it may not; perhaps, future American Jews will be no more than "the custodians of a museum" (p. 142).

There are, however, some flaws in the book. Defining, e.g., Judaism as a people-religion, a faith organically joined to a specific people, Mr. Glazer uses the terms "nation," "nationality," "people," "race" interchangeably, though aware of what he calls their "different connotations" (p. 3). Or, in discussing the Jewish revival, the new consciousness of Jewish suburbanites, he very much remains the sociologist. He sees the social factors involved, but gives little attention to the breakdown of the secular ideal of man's self-sufficiency under the onslaught of a Hitler, a Stalin, and amidst the uncertainties of today and of tomorrow. Again, he writes: "The role that in Christianity is played by God's grace . . . is taken in Judaism by the holy community. . . . [the community] made holy not because it is Jewish but because it lives under God's law" (p. 146). Here Christianity is not fully understood. Though grace is the most intimate bond between God and man, it is also a bond between man and man. One cannot attain fullness of Christian life except by entering the holy community of the new covenant, the Church.

JOHN M. OESTERREICHER

Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies
Seton Hall University

Master Roger Williams. A Biography. By Ola Elizabeth Winslow. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1957. Pp. xi, 328. $6.00.)

The author of this study, Ola Elizabeth Winslow of Radcliffe College, has portrayed Roger Williams as an intellectual pioneer. Miss Winslow has recreated Williams' life against the political, social, and religious background of the times. She considers his education at Cambridge, his service as chaplain to a prominent English family, and stresses the influential friendships that Williams made in these early years which later prove helpful to him. This successful early career ended in 1629 when Williams abruptly decided to sail for the new world where he immediately became the center of a religious controversy in both Massachusetts Bay and Plymouth colonies which resulted in his fleeing deportation and founding a new settlement at Providence on land purchased from friendly Indians. The year was 1636. Williams, however, did not receive English recognition until 1644, when he journeyed to the mother country and through the assistance of influential friends received his first charter, the most democratic granted to an English colony. Williams' subsequent life was spent in serving the colony he had founded in whatever capacity the citizens called upon him to fulfill. In the early years it was as chief officer; in his later life it was in the role of an elder statesman.

Miss Winslow stresses Williams' friendly relations with the Indians. All in all she has sketched the salient events of Williams' career, but she has added little to the story already known. She seldom interprets. Thus in the grant of the colony's charter, she ignores or fails to realize the tremendous significance of the grant of power conceded to the colony. To this reviewer the author appears too absorbed with the thesis that Williams can do no wrong, and her style is bookish. It is unfortunate that the footnotes have been grouped at the end of the book, an arrangement that resulted in the author frequently incorporating in the body of the story details that should be in the footnotes. A few errors should be noted. The territory of the Narragansetts did not end at the Pawtuxet River (p. 147), but extended at least twenty-five miles farther southward, and Cocumscussoc, Williams' Indian trading post, was located approximately twenty miles from Providence, not six (p. 221).

ROBERT C. NEWBOLD

Our Lady of Providence Seminary

The South in the Revolution, 1763-1789. By John Richard Alden. [History of the South, Volume III. Edited by Wendell Holmes Stephenson and E. Merton Coulter.] (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1957. Pp. xv, 442. $7.50.)

This work is the first single volume devoted to the South's role in the American Revolution, and as such is an important contribution to the study of the period. In general the book is well written and the chapters on the West are informative and contain much insight into the revolutionary frontier, an area frequently neglected in a work of this nature. The sections dealing with military affairs are likewise good. More might have been done with the economic causes for revolt, particularly with the problems of paper currency. Only a few paragraphs take up this important aspect of the movement (pp. 61, 65). The author dismisses the Currency Act of 1764 as being unimportant because there was no immediate reaction to the measure in Virginia. A year later, however, the pinch was obviously felt when the resolves of the Stamp Act Congress, to which the South generally adhered, mention the "scarcity of specie." Similarly the South Carolina assembly bridled in their resolutions over the shortage of money, even despite the fact that the rice state continually issued certificates for the payment of taxes which circulated as paper. Also South Carolina's Wilkes Fund dispute had economic overtones as the lower house attempted the aid of Wilkes with a paper money issue (pp. 112-113).

The period between 1765 and 1770 presents a sorry picture of economic distress—one of debtor vs. creditor, many judgments for debt, cries for

payment of accounts by merchants and tradesmen, and by the evidence of the colonial newspapers, it seems, more bartering than usual. The Townshend Acts, e.g., brought forth the following complaint: "At a time" when "your credit is as good as the Bank of England, — ye are restrained from making *Paper Money* a lawful tender. By other resolutions ye are prevented from the usual supplies of *Gold* and *Silver,* which in some Measure would have provided against that Hardship." The duties would "carry every solitary straggling Piece of [silver] over the Atlantic, like Ghosts over the Stygian Lake, never to return." (*South Carolina Gazette,* September 7, 1769.) One cannot neglect this reason for revolt to follow the old path of political dissatisfaction found in every old state history of the period.

Puzzling is the statement that there was no "internal revolution" in the South (pp. 306, 338). If "internal revolution" refers to a cataclysmic upheaval, then there was none. But the term applies to significant changes within the states and these the author does not overlook but underestimates. The abolition of entail and primogeniture, the beginnings of separation of Church and State, the broadening of the suffrage and representation in the assemblies, liberal constitutions with safeguards for personal liberty, the birth of democratic ideas such as public education and the abolition of slavery aroused fear among more conservative rebels so as to cause a general reaction by the late 1780's. To assert that these alterations in the structure of southern society would have come without military conflict, is an irrelevant guess beyond proof.

There is also some evidence of social levelling. In South Carolina mechanics, hardly acceptable before the war, rubbed elbows with aristocrats, paraded "esquire" after their names, and sat in the legislature with their pre-war betters. The departure of most of the Tories caused a general shift to the left. Transference of property through confiscation and wild speculation and the rise of new rebel merchants indicate economic change. The author denies a great and significant turnover in land, however, through the confiscation of Tory estates, but he then supports this with "Close and fruitful studies of the seizure and sale of Tory property in the South have not been made . . ." (p. 338, n. 22).

Despite all this, *The South in the Revolution* is a very good book. Today, when the outpourings of the presses are largely concerned with the Civil War and the problems of secession, almost *ad nauseum,* it is heartening to read about the South sacrificing for the Union and to remember men like Christopher Gadsden and Lighthorse Harry Lee speaking and acting forcefully in its behalf.

RICHARD WALSH

Georgetown University

George Washington. A Biography. By Douglas Southall Freeman. Volume VI, *Patriot and President.* With a foreword by Dumas Malone. Volume VII, *First In Peace.* By John Alexander Carroll and Mary Wells Ashworth. Completing the Biography by Douglas Southall Freeman. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1954 and 1957. Pp. xiv, 529; xxiv, 729. $10.00 per volume.)

Dr. Freeman was correcting proof on the sixth volume of his monumental *Washington* when he died. It then seemed, even to his editorial associates, that the seventh volume, covering the last seven years of Washington's life, would never appear. Through the efforts of Dr. Carroll and Mrs. Ashworth, and the support given them by the publishers of these volumes, by the Guggenheim Foundation, and by the Carnegie Corporaion, here has now been brought to magnificent completion the first truly definitive biography of the first President of the United States.

Freeman had planned for the last volume a final and fully interpretive sketch of the character of Washington. The author's untimely death deprives us of the final comments of Freeman's perceptive intellect on certain enigmatic elements of Washington's character. In this lack alone does the seventh volume disappoint the historian. These two volumes taken together realize admirably Freeman's original plan for an "unbroken treatment" of the last sixteen years of Washington's life. The authors of Volume VII are to be congratulated for having so well adhered to Freeman's literary style and methods of handling historical sources. The same ample treatment of events in Washington's life and of the background elements necessary to make them fully intelligible appear in both volumes —the one completed by Freeman himself and its successor, written by his literary heirs.

Washington returned to Mount Vernon from New York in the last month of 1783 determined to become again the Virginia planter, and apparently convinced that the span of his public life was behind him. He soon came to realize that this was not so. As the period of the Confederation wore on and the effectiveness of central government weakened, Washington found himself appealed to from all quarters for advice and for leadership. His own keen sense of civic obligation forced him to assume an ever-increasing interest in steps which might help to preserve the unity of the American states. When the Constitutional Convention met in Philadelphia on May 25, 1787, Washington was its unanimously-elected president. His constant attendance as presiding officer had a great deal to do with moderating the sharp inter-state differences which threatened on a number of occasions to disrupt the entire convention. Freeman believed that in the struggle for ratification of the Constitution the argument which probably assured adoption of the basic charter was that since Washington

and Franklin had signed it, it must be good. Washington got back to his beloved Mount Vernon after the convention adjourned, but nineteen months later public life had claimed him again—he was busy organizing a new government as its first president. Approximately half of Volume VI is devoted to Washington's first term as president. This is the story of Washington's reactions to the development of party strife, and of his increasingly difficult job in attempting to keep himself and the presidential office aloof from this strife. It was an attempt which could not suceed. Axiomatic to Washington was the belief that strong central government was essential to American unity. He could in honesty support no other than the Federalist cause.

Volume VII, *First In Peace,* deals with only seven years of Washington's life, but they were seven extremely vital years for both Washington and for the nation he governed. His first term as president completed, with the uncertainties of uncharted beginnings behind him, Washington could and did handle the presidential office with even greater fortitude and confidence than he had exhibited during the earlier years. The French Revolution, political factionism in the cabinet, and the whiskey rebellion tested both his abilities and his patience. Washington's ratification of Jay's Treaty with Britain brought down upon the president's head an unprecedented torrent of criticism and abuse. It was with real satisfaction that he refused a third term and in 1797 retired once again to Mount Vernon. Although but a little over two years of life remained to him the general still could not relax. An imminent threat of war with France led to his appointment by President John Adams as commander-in-chief of American military forces in July, 1798. This commission was still in force when, on Friday, December 13, 1799, Washington caught a cold. Within twenty-four hours he was dead—victim of a "strep throat" and the medical practices of his day.

These two volumes, like their predecessors, are abundantly endowed with a complete scholarly apparatus. Footnotes are so numerous and so full that they provide a running commentary to the text. At the end of the sixth volume is an eighty-seven page "Select Critical Bibliography" which would have value as a separate book. Maps, illustrations, and appendices provide new material of a documentary nature; indices are complete and helpful; and fine bindings and documentary end-papers add the finishing touches to this excellently definitive biography. Dumas Malone's prefatory note to Volume VI, entitled "The Pen of Douglas Southall Freeman," is an appropriate appreciation of the author of this and of other fine biographical studies of American military leaders. It is fitting that this short essay which describes in some detail Freeman's methods of research and writing should be included in the same volume with the last words that his pen wrote. Were no other biographies than this on his list of writings,

Douglas Southall Freeman would be assured of a permanent place in American historiography.

JOHN J. MENG

Hunter College of the City of New York

The Hudson's Bay Company as an Imperial Factor, 1821-1869. By John S. Galbraith. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1957. Pp. viii, 500. $6.75.)

While there are histories of the Hudson's Bay Company, there has not been a study of the great monopoly as a factor in imperial expansion on the North American continent. The present volume, by searching inquiry into the political activities of the company and by wisely limiting its scope to the years 1821 to 1869, has very ably supplied this deficiency. For a long time to come, it will stand as a definitive work. After two introductory chapters to place the reader in the proper milieu, the author states the principles which fostered and consolidated the company on the Canadian, the southern, and the western frontier. Simply stated the first and fundamental principle was this: "the trade must be made unprofitable to the opposition even at the risk of ioss to the Company." The process was very modern: small men must be undercut and ruined; larger operators, bought out or contained. The means to these ends, including bribery, were hardly reprehensible according to the business practices of the day. Indeed, they were sometimes commendable, as on the northeast coast of North America, where the "principal object" of the British and Russian traders was the propagation of Christianity and the spread of morality and civilization among the natives of those parts.

A narration of company activities in the Snake country and on the northwest coast of North America follows. From it we learn that by 1839 the trade was "secure" from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific and from Cape Spencer to the Bay of San Francisco. As time, nonetheless, was on the side of the Americans, the attempt of the company board to hold the clock still by engaging the British Foreign Office in its interest, is the story of men incapable of grasping realities and completely out of step with the course of events. The "honourable compromise" of 1846 was not a compromise; it was a surrender by the British. (A magnificent example of failure on the part of company management may be found in its treatment of Catholic missionaries. Dr. Galbraith is the first author to point up the importance of this question.)

The remaining chapters deal with "the aftermath" of the Oregon question, the sale of the company, and the rise of a national or continental spirit in Canada. Again we are introduced to men who are obtuse to reali-

ties: incapable of the large view. The days of the fur trade are running out; Canada will expand from the Atlantic to the Pacific; a new economy based on settlers, lumberers, and miners will take root. And the employment of shady characters and immoral means to block these developments was downright folly as well as expensive, for paternalism—in North America at least—has ever been a poor competitor with free settlement. The theme of this book is simply another narration of this fact.

There are a few minor faults: Fort Ellice is not on map on page 47; "Alexander" for Andrew McDermot (p. 62); "1869" for 1839 (p. 199); Demers did not leave Montreal with Blanchet in the spring of 1838 (p. 203); Blanchard's name does not appear in the index; of the three sketch maps, the one on page 83 is most inaccurate and there is none for Chapter 8, where one would be very helpful; Assiniboia is not delimited; the references to T. C. Elliott and to H. H. Bancroft are badly dated; and there is no reference to Warren Ferris, *Life in the Rocky Mountains* (p. 106), nor is this work in two editions (1940) listed in the bibliography. The only shortcoming in the book, as I see it, is a presumption that the reader is fully acquainted with the development of the Dominion of Canada. Dates and facts are given; but the narrative does not merge sufficiently with this development—a principal factor in the story. All in all, however, one must congratulate the author on a great contribution and one should congratulate the company which, by permitting its archives to be exploited, made possible such a contribution to our knowledge of nineteenth-century history.

WILLIAM L. DAVIS

Gonzaga University

The Role of the Supreme Court in American Government and Politics, 1835-1864. By Charles Grove Haines and Foster H. Sherwood. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1957. Pp. x, 533. $7.50.)

This exhaustive study of the Supreme Court in the days of Roger B. Taney's chief justiceship is a companion volume to an earlier account of the court under Marshall. The first volume was the work of Haines alone, while this newer effort was begun by Haines and completed by one of his former students after the former's death. Let it be noted at the outset that the two volumes are indispensable to an understanding of the pre-Civil War Supreme Court. While the second volume may suffer, inevitably it would seem, from the shift in authorship, it stands up well under close scrutiny, and is a worthy addition to and cumulation of the scholarship on the highest court of the United States.

Haines' interest in the Supreme Court is too well known, and his publications on its part in American history have been too often used, for special reference to be made to these circumstances now. What, perhaps, may not be so well known, though it might have been deduced even from the foreword to the earlier volume, is that he seems to have succeeded in instilling this enthusiastic interest and careful scholarship into his students and co-workers. As Dr. Sherwood points out in the preface to this book, and as Haines himself remarked in the earlier one, the association of the two men began more than a decade ago; if there are differences of opinion and treatment, then, they are scholarly differences. Haines would surely have respected and been pleased by the way in which Sherwood has brought to partial completion the task attempted by the older man. Let us hope that this is only partial completion, and that additional volumes will bring more nearly up to date this account of the Supreme Court's part in shaping or contributing to American government and politics. That the concept of such a role is not new would be admitted by both authors, but the informed speculation of many writers or teachers on the subject may now depend upon these volumes for authoritative references and innumerable illustrations of the idea.

Instead of viewing the court as the Olympian group which the nineteenth-century writers were apt to do, or as the more mediocre than average collection of men, as some twentieth-century writers seem to prefer, Haines and Sherwood have looked upon these justices of the decades after Marshall as having engaged in political activity of a special kind. It would have been strange, indeed, if some of them had not been interested in politics after they had achieved appointment to the supreme bench; after all, men like Taney had been practicing politicians for years. On the other hand, men like Story had been much more interested in the philosophy of the law—or so it has ordinarily been assumed—and the interest of Story in practical politics may have been due to the influence of Marshall.

Haines and Sherwood show, with a wealth of illustrative detail, that all the justices—McLean, Wayne, Taney, Catron, Daniel, Nelson, Grier, Campbell, and Clifford, to take them in the order of their appointment—were keenly interested in political questions, aware of their importance as affecting legislative activity in the states and in the national legislature, and were concerned about the necessity of considering the political situations in the states and the nation before they handed down their decisions. This complex of ideas was not, perhaps, explicit in the consciousness of the justices, but they would have been less or more than ordinary mortals if they had not known the atmosphere within which they worked. It is to their credit, rather than to their shame, that their awareness is evident in so many cases, and it is a distinct tribute that Haines and Sherwood

have gathered together so much evidence to show this attention to political matters.

Much of the work had already been done, of course, in articles or monographic studies; these have been carefully sifted and condensed. Much additional work had to be undertaken *ab initio*, and this—begun under Haines' direction and completed by Sherwood—has been completed very creditably. It is a pity that two late articles, one by Swisher on the Dred Scott decision, and one by Beitzinger on the cases of *Ableman v. Booth*, were not available to Sherwood when this work was being completed. As it is, however, the volume leaves little to be desired either as a work of reference, or as a solid study in the history of the Supreme Court before the Civil War.

The style of the second volume is not the incisive style, with the brilliant deduction notable on every page, that one had become accustomed to in Haines' earlier volume; the clarity of expression in the later volume, however, and the breadth and depth of scholarship make this a worthy companion to the first study. If urging be needed to make Sherwood undertake additional volumes, let these remarks be construed as part of such an effort.

SISTER MARIE CAROLYN KLINKHAMER

The Catholic University of America

The Prohibition Movement in California, 1848-1933. By Gilman M. Ostrander. [University of California Publications in History, Volume 57.] (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1957. Pp. vi, 241. $5.00.)

Lovers of Californiana will find this recent addition to the University of California Publications in History a pleasant surprise. The title might suggest a bare chronicle of a disembodied movement. In reality the author gives the reader a lively commentary on the mores of the past century along with a faithful fulfillment of the title's promise. Two aspects of the work which cannot fail to impress the reader are the entanglement of the prohibition movement with California politics and the inability of this wholly negative program to survive its successful achievement. One of the best examples of the political importance of the movement is had in the account the author gives of the Rominger Bill. "A Hearst representative approached the 1917 legislature with a temperance program designed especially for California. The Hearst press had for some years opposed the saloons editorially, and the Hearst plan was an anti-saloon and liquor restriction bill rather than a prohibition measure. Its special feature was an

ironclad protection which it tried to give to the California wine industry" (p. 135).

The main flaw in the Rominger Bill, as far as the wine industry was concerned, was the fact that it defined legal dry wine as that which contained up to ten per cent alcohol. Since most wine contained more than that, the wine industry itself opposed the bill, while the Hearst press gradually withdrew its support. "Following the defeat of his own Rominger bill, Hearst had ordered the San Francisco *Examiner* and the Los Angeles *Examiner* to make a straight-out fight for prohibition. But by 1927 Hearst had taken the new position that 'the Anti-Saloon League with its dictation to the elected representatives . . . with its usurpation of authority, must be banished from the United States.' By 1929 Hearst had become in the eyes of the California Anti-Saloon League, 'the commanding general of the liquor forces'" (pp. 191-192).

On the national level, the prohibition group gave Herbert Hoover immense help in 1928. An account in the *Liberator* recorded that the Anti-Saloon League "literally exhausted its resources in men and money to beat Smith in the primaries" (p. 191), and the struggle continued until it ended in triumph in the general election. That the movement was substantially negative was evidenced by the fact that the Eighteenth Amendment was viewed as the culmination of the work for "Arthur Briggs, Gandier's successor as superintendent of the California League, declared after the election that the League's work was virtually completed . . . the League could rest victorious" (pp. 146-147). San Franciscans will undoubtedly be amused or irked by this frank account of the overpowering thirst of their forebears. Reference to the San Francisco-Sacramento route as the "whiskey strip," and to the Golden State as a "bootleggers' paradise" will probably also evoke various emotional responses. Nevertheless, the author supplies interesting and impressive statistics about the number of saloons, barrooms, and gambling houses in an area with a population of 36,000 and concludes with the devastating remark that "San Francisco had one legal saloon for every hundred people . . . and it was reputed to have proportionately the greatest number of drinking places of any city in the world" (p. 4).

Admittedly Dr. Ostrander's task was difficult, complex, and yet necessary for a fuller appraisal of California's colorful history, constituted as it is of various national and religious aspects. But in the opinion of this reviewer, his treatment of the Catholic aspect would have been benefited by reference to Sister Joan Bland's excellent account of the history of the Catholic Total Abstinence movement in her *Hibernian Crusade* (Washington, 1951). The author would then have had a clearer insight into the Catholic attitude toward total abstinence, which *per se* no informed Catholic could accept as an obligation for anyone. What Mr. Ostrander refers

to as a lack of co-operation on the part of Catholics with the Protestant denominations after 1850 in fighting intemperance (p. 7) might then be understood merely as the distinction Catholics made—and still make—between the use and the abuse of a thing indifferent in itself. Despite the prevalence of conditions in California that would seem to warrant compulsion in some form as an effectual means of promoting temperance, Catholic teaching does not subscribe to any policy that violates the individual's freedom or usurps his responsibility for personal conduct.

Other than this point, Dr. Ostrander is to be commended for handling with admirable objectivity a vast amount of material, and he proves again that the key to significant historical writing is found in an undeviating devotion to source integrity.

SISTER JOAN MARIE DONOHUE

College of Notre Dame
Belmont

Created Equal: The Complete Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858. Edited and Introduction by Paul M. Angle. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1958. Pp. xxxiii, 421. $7.50.)

This is a timely book, since this year commemorates the centennial of the famous debates. The editor, a native of Illinois and a Lincoln student of great reputation, has produced a much needed work. His introduction gives us a fine historical background for the famous political struggle. The book contains all the major speeches of the campaign, in addition to the seven joint debates. There are numerous editorial comments by the partisan press, and a map showing the location of each major speech and debate which adds interest and understanding to the arguments advanced.

Many serious students of the events preceding the Civil War will find a reading of the complete speeches sometimes tedious because of repetition, but they are, nevertheless, rewarding for an understanding of the men and their times. Our national political thinking and party alignment were undergoing a revolution. Lincoln, a leader of the Whigs in Illinois, and Trumbull, a former Democrat, became the chief spokesmen for the Republican Party, while the Democratic occupant of the White House was leaving no stone unturned to defeat Douglas, because of his bitter fight against the Lecompton Constitution which was an administration measure.

History has placed great emphasis on the famous answer given by Douglas to Lincoln's question in Freeport, regarding the right of the people of the territory to legislate on the question of slavery. It may well be that his answer alienated some Douglas supporters in the South, but the real damage was done by his courageous fight on the Lecompton Consti-

tution. As the Confederacy was to die because of its cherished dream of states' rights, Douglas met his political death because of his great dream of popular sovereignty. He failed to see or would not voice a moral appraisal of slavery, and on this question Lincoln lost the senate seat, and Douglas became a sectional candidate, a charge that he had repeatedly hurled at Lincoln. The speech will more fully convince the reader that Douglas' position on slavery and the treatment of the colored man while sincere and straightforward, had "a Little Rock ring." On the other hand, Lincoln's house divided speech and his denial of abolitionism while somewhat inconsistent, gave him room to move forward with the times.

THOMAS B. DUNN

Morris, Illinois

Tin Can on a Shingle. By William Chapman White and Ruth White. (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc. 1957. Pp. xi, 176. $3.50.)

How the Merrimac Won. By R. W. Daly. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co. 1957. Pp. xi, 211. $4.00.)

The Rebel Shore: The Story of Union Sea Power in the Civil War. By James M. Merrill. (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Co. 1957. Pp. vii, 246. $4.75.)

These three books are attempts to keep the naval aspect of the Civil War represented in the wave of literature set in motion by the approach of the centennial of that conflict. In *Tin Can on a Shingle* Ruth and William Chapman White are concerned with the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac* although, as the title suggests, the main focus is on the *Monitor*. Written chiefly from secondary sources, it presents in brief and popular form the story of the famous ironclads, and of the men who fought and believed in them. The book is well written. It is annoying, however, to see Edwin M. Stanton identified at least three times as "Secretary of the Army." But this is a minor flaw in a volume that recaptures so much of the drama, excitement, and suspense that marked the brief careers of both ships. The book is enhanced by illustrations, and plans of the *Monitor* are incorporated in the end papers. An index and a bibliography contribute to the utility of the volume.

Professor Daly's work is only incidentally concerned with the famous duel between the ironclads. He believes that in advertising the rebuilt *Merrimac* as a blockade breaker, Confederate propaganda gave rise to the legend that only the timely arrival of the *Monitor* saved the Union blockading squadron. Actually, the *Merrimac* "was a harbor defense ship and would have been swamped in a moderate sea." It is Daly's thesis that she

won a strategic victory by denying the Union Navy the use of the James River. As a result, McClellan was unable to take full advantage of the mobility provided by water communications for a quick strike at Richmond up the James River. By denying the Union the use of the James, the *Merrimac* forced McClellan to change his plans and to undertake a slow movement up the peninsula. The ship thus saved Richmond and ended the North's hope for a short war. This thesis is documented mainly by citations from the volumes of the official records of the Union and Confederate armies and navies. A bibliographical note and an index are also included. The book offers a stimulating interpretation of a much discussed campaign, and is a useful addition to the literature of the Civil War.

The Rebel Shore is an attempt to evaluate the importance of Union sea power. More specifically, it is a popular account of the strengthening of the blockade through the seizure of strategic bases along the coastline of the Confederacy. Dr. Merrill says that these Union amphibious attacks "were, perhaps, more significant than the blockade itself." The navy was the first to plant the flag on the soil of the Confederacy. The southern reaction to these forays supports the theory that the states' rights attitude helped to destroy the Confederacy. But the story itself tends to be too episodic. Vivid glimpses of war at the grass roots level are seldom balanced with descriptions of the changing strategic effect of the seizure of these bases. The only maps are those of the entire southern coastline which form the end papers. Detailed maps of at least some of the areas of operation would be a great asset to the reader. This is particularly true in a work designed for the general reader. Merrill writes with considerable gusto. While this makes for a certain amount of pleasant reading, this reviewer felt that some of his glib generalizations raised doubts about his sources and his conclusions. There are no footnotes, but the author assures us that "all the direct and indirect quotations are based on materials cited in the bibliography and all the events described have the authority of contemporary sources." Merrill undoubtedly did a great deal of research on this subject, and the general reader will find this book an interesting introduction to the role of the Union Navy in the Civil War.

HAROLD D. LANGLEY

Washington, D. C.

Theodore Roosevelt. The Formative Years, 1858-1886, A Biography. Volume I. By Carleton Putnam. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1958. Pp. xiii, 626. $10.00.)

Happily for the historians, and for others who are celebrating the centennial of Theodore Roosevelt's birth, this admirable first volume of a new

biography serves to elucidate most carefully the youth and early manhood years of formation. Building upon the foundations laid by Hagedorn, Wister, and Riis, and aided by the co-operation of the surviving members of the Roosevelt family—who made available for the first time a diary and many family letters—Mr. Putnam has worked over his extensive materials with industry and care to produce a first rate account. He has not been in the least inhibited by space requirements, and he has even produced a book which is rare in these times for having the footnotes where they belong, at the bottom of the page. Moreover, the romantic touch is apparent and most appropriate for the subject, for the author has visited and experienced vicariously the haunts of the young Roosevelt from Oyster Bay to Maine to the Badlands of North Dakota. One has the feeling that Teddy himself would have enjoyed the process by which he obtained the necessary preparation to write about the outdoor life, even to the experience of making low level flights over the Dakota ranching and big game hunting areas.

According to the divisions of the book, beginning with the life of the Roosevelt family in the Civil War years, it is apparent that the young Theodore was to react strongly to a succession of major influences. Fortified by a deeply emotional and romantic Protestant Christianity, he learned by example the strenuous life of high moral purpose from his father—"the best man I ever knew." It was his father who also set him to developing a strong body to serve his strong ambition, but it was the boy himself who made strength and courage the over-emphasized virtues. Next came travel in Europe and to the Near East. Mr. Putnam rescues two wide ranging ventures abroad in the youthful period as a major influence on the later president by a diligent use of the diary which was faithfully kept; and here he provides a major corrective to the *Autobiography,* which tended to play down the importance of this cultural experience. Then there was Harvard in the late 1870's, after which came politics in the New York Assembly, and the western ranching. Critical experiences crowded the years 1880-1886, including the death of the elder Theodore—which was a terrible blow to the Harvard undergraduate—the marriage to Alice Lee, and her unexpected death in the midst of a most exciting contest in the New York Assembly over the city government of New York. During this time TR was a student at the Columbia Law School and published his excellent *Naval History of the War of 1812.* It is the author's achievement that he has treated all of these episodes carefully and estimated reasonably their places in the making of the man. His success augurs well for the remaining volumes, but there will be a slight difficulty in terminology: Roosevelt preserved all his life a youthful capacity for absorbing new experiences, and the comment of Spring Rice that as president the man was still "about six," can be said to indicate that he was ever in the formative years.

In the background material one might expect to note some errors on the part of an author making his first venture in writing what is, inevitably, American history as well as good biography. But there is very little to disturb the careful reader. The Constitution is misrepresented as to the amending process (p. 293), and there is an unfortunate excursion into the frontier hypothesis with an uncritical acceptance of the safety valve corollary (p. 298). For the rest, Mr. Putnam has remained close to his own sources and to the best of modern scholarship.

JOHN T. FARRELL

The Catholic University of America

American Industry and the European Immigrant, 1860-1885. By Charlotte Erickson. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1957. Pp. x, 269. $4.75.)

If the carefully documented thesis of this volume is correct, we are confronted by still another irony of history. The author believes that the traditional position of American trade unions regarding immigration is the result not only of a racist attitude but also of misinformation about the experience of the unions themselves. Beginning with the agitation of the Knights of Labor for the Foran Act of 1885, Miss Erickson states, American labor has been "on a track of prejudice and fear with regard to immigration which has become tradition and policy, unassailable and inviolate." Behind the anxiety of the unions in the 1880's was the recurrent appearance, on the scene of a strike, of large groups of new immigrants, often from southern and eastern Europe. Their arrival was associated quite falsely with contract labor which, although legal between 1864 and 1885, was far less common than labor leaders supposed. The availability of strike breakers was due to the activities not of contract labor importers but of private employment agencies in the larger cities. Yet among the knights one group did have a stake in the elimination of the contract system; the highly skilled window glass workers realized that their strikes could be broken only by skilled workers from England and Belgium, who actually were most often imported under contract. It was this cleverly led group, the only one which really had much to gain, which exploited the general prejudice against the new immigration, and thus gained the active support of the knights for the Foran Act. Organized labor became convinced that the flood from eastern Europe must be stopped by outlawing contract labor; when they succeeded in outlawing it, what they stopped was a trickle from England and Belgium.

The illusion of the Knights of Labor that their position was seriously imperiled by contract labor was passed on to the American Federation of

Labor and with it the tendency to associate the problem with immigrants from southern and eastern Europe. When repeated efforts to strengthen the Foran Act by amendment proved fruitless, the movement turned to literacy tests as a means of curbing immigration. Even the national origins pattern adopted after World War I and essentially still with us was based on the confused thinking which began in the post-Civil War period. The fact is that even though contract labor was permitted by law for twenty years during a period of phenomenal industrial development, it was rarely used. Immigration was motivated by propaganda, personal hope of economic opportunities, and letters from relatives and friends in the United States. The author indicates that a more rational program for the control of immigration in terms of the economic needs of the country might have been promoted by the labor movement, had not its thinking taken so confused a form in the 1880's. There may be an element of over-simplification in this view, but there is no doubt that Miss Erickson's work has cast valuable light on a problem in attitudes which still affects national policy.

This study gives every evidence of exhaustive research. The author has made intensive use of the Powderly Papers at the Catholic University of America, the Henry Carey Papers at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, the collections of trade union materials at Ann Arbor, the Johns Hopkins, Howard and the University of Wisconsin, and the records of the Bureau of Immigration. Sources from our European consulates and from the governments of the sending countries were combed with equal diligence. In organization, style, and interpretive skill also, *American Industry and the European Immigrant* seems worthy of high commendation.

SISTER JOAN BLAND

Trinity College

America and the Fight for Irish Freedom, 1866-1922. By Charles Callan Tansill. (New York: Devin-Adair Co. 1957. Pp. xi, 489. $7.50.)

A specialist in diplomatic history, Professor Tansill has produced in this book a work of prime importance for the study of Irish-American relations. Apart from a survey of the relations between the United States and the more revolutionary groups in Ireland down to 1914 the work is essentially a study of the years after the beginning of World War I. The author traces the connection of the Irish in America with the Sinn Fein movement in Ireland and with the American government. He describes the impact on this triangular relationship of World War I, the 1916 rebellion, and Woodrow Wilson's attempt to have the Treaty of Versailles

and the League of Nations accepted by the American people. Dr. Tansill's extensive knowledge of American diplomatic history is of great value in delineating the attitude of the White House in its efforts to maintain good relations with its war-time ally, Great Britain, and, at the same time, not to sacrifice the support of the politically influential Irish-American organizations.

It is with the principal organizer of the Irish in the United States at this period, Judge Daniel F. Cohalan, that the author is specially concerned. When Eamon de Valera, as head of the Irish Republican government struggling to establish itself in an Ireland still under British rule, came to the United States in June, 1919, he found himself at loggerheads with Cohalan. While de Valera sought full recognition by the American government of the Irish Republican government, Cohalan sought what he considered the more realistic aim, the effective support of the American government for the Irish claim to national self-determination. Professor Tansill sees de Valera's attitude as due partly to an inadequate understanding of American domestic politics and partly to a failure to grasp the fact that Cohalan was first and foremost a patriotic American and, therefore, unwilling to accept direction as to aims and methods from any political authority that was not American.

In the preface Dr. Tansill states that his book is an attempt to refute the many errors and misrepresentations of "the De Valera court historians" in their one-sided accounts of the de Valera-Cohalan dispute. By using the large store of Cohalan private papers, not previously available, he has been able to bring much new information to light for the purpose of defending his hero. In stating his aim so clearly in the preface the author anticipates, to some extent, the charge that his book lacks historical objectivity, that he is uncritical in his championing of Cohalan, and that he is unfair to Cohalan's opponents. In his interpretation of Irish history generally he tends to be influenced unduly by an exaggerated antipathy to England.

America and the Fight for Irish Freedom, 1866-1922 contains a most valuable bibliography of primary and secondary sources. In addition to the Cohalan Papers, privately held, Professor Tansill has consulted the private papers in the Library of Congress of many political figures connected directly or indirectly with Irish-American affairs. The list of American, English, and Irish newspapers is very impressive. As one could expect in the case of a specialist in diplomatic history, Dr. Tansill has investigated a great body of official documents, including embassy and consular archives of London, Dublin, Cork, and Queenstown in the Department of State in Washington as well as presidential papers and congressional records and reports.

MAURICE R. O'CONNELL

University of Portland

Portrait of an American Labor Leader: William L. Hutcheson. Saga of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, 1881-1954. By Maxwell C. Raddock. (Yonkers: American Institute of Social Science, Inc. 1955. Pp. xviii, 430. $5.00.)

The leaders of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners commissioned this biography of their late president early in 1954. During the next three years Maxwell C. Raddock put the book together and published about 87,000 copies under the impressive-sounding imprint of the American Institute of Social Science—actually a private corporation which Raddock heads, and which supposedly engages in economic and social research. In return for his services, Raddock received altogether $310,000 from the brotherhood's treasury.

Hutcheson deserved a good biography. He built his power to such an extent as to reign over the carpenters for thirty-six years after 1915, virtually unchallenged, and meanwhile forged the union into one of America's largest and richest labor organizations. His was the "craft" type union, with the protection of "job security" always its central concern —a concern which involved Hutcheson and his organization in numerous disputes not only with employers, but with "brother" A. F. of L. unions, the advocates of "industrial" unionism, the government, and the public at large. Moreover, Hutcheson's political role arouses interest. From 1920 onward he remained an active Republican, unlike most other labor leaders. While using the G. O. P.'s stock arguments in attacks on New Deal office-seekers and warning against the rise of a paternalistic leviathan state, he none the less endorsed the New Deal's labor and social measures, urging the Republicans to adopt them in their own platforms.

Certainly a competent study of Hutcheson's career, as much as the lives of Hillman, Lewis, or Reuther, would illuminate one aspect of the multi-faceted American labor movement and demonstrate again what a conglomerate affair that movement has been. Unfortunately, Raddock's book is not that competent study. The obvious questions that arise out of Hutcheson's rise to power, his trade union tactics, his political activities, and his ideological commitments are treated only superficially, if at all. Their effects on the members of Hutcheson's own union, on the public interest, and on the economy in general are hardly explored, aside from the author's conclusion that "Big Bill" was right in everything he did. Throughout the work there is ample evidence that Raddock paid little attention to the niceties of scholarly composition, and almost as little attention to the sources. The papers of Hutcheson and of the brotherhood were used, but apparently only to the extent that they heaped praise on the subject's head. Since very few of the other essential primary sources were consulted, Hutcheson's many antagonists invariably come out on the short

end of the author's *ex parte* treatment. Moreover, the style of the book is choppy and repetitious, while its organization has little logic. A summary of the brotherhood's history prior to 1915, e.g., comes at the end of the work in a chapter added as an afterthought when the biography was completed. There are factual errors, spelling errors, and typographical errors too numerous to mention. There is no bibliography and citations of sources are inadequate, and often altogether absent. Most damaging of all is the allegation that Raddock lifted large portions of his book verbatim from a Ph.D. thesis and several published works, without due acknowledgement to the authors. The latter charge was made in testimony before the Senate Labor Rackets Investigating Committee on June 25, 1958.

The net result of the $310,000 investment, then, is a biography that falls far short of doing justice to "Big Bill" Hutcheson's role in American labor history, and a poor bargain for the members of the carpenters' union whose dues, of course, were the source of Raddock's lavish "research" and publication subsidy. Recent revelations indicate that some union officials have not been sufficiently careful in the expenditure of members' funds. It is particularly disconcerting to have it intimated that one new direction for the mis-spending of union money is in the field of scholarly research and publication.

J. Joseph Huthmacher

Georgetown University

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The Association will hold its thirty-ninth annual meeting at the Hotel Mayflower in Washington on December 28-30 in conjunction with the American Historical Association and the societies which meet at that time. The joint session of the two Associations this year will be devoted to the Catholic Church and the Enlightenment in Latin America with the two papers being read by John Tate Lanning of Duke University and Karl M. Schmitt of the University of Texas. The general session of our Association will this year have the timely topic of the so-called "Catholic question" in American presidential campaigns with Vincent P. De Santis of the University of Notre Dame handling the period from 1865 to 1900 and Edmund A. Moore of the University of Connecticut treating the period since 1900. The presidential address of Stephan Kuttner of the Catholic University of America will be entitled "Legal History: A Neglected Field of Studies." Further details will be found in the program for the annual meeting which will be mailed to the members in November.

The eleventh meeting of the Tuscan Society for the History of the Risorgimento was devoted to the general theme of Catholicism from 1815 to 1870. On the first day Arturo Carlo Jemolo read a paper on liberal Catholicism and Roger Aubert one on French Catholicism from 1815 to 1870. On the second day Ettore Passerin D'Entreves treated liberal Catholicism during the years 1849-1870; A. Simon the Belgian liberal Catholics in the same period, and Heinrich Lutz the Catholics of Germany and Austria. On April 27 Guido Verucci treated intransigent Catholicism between the years 1815 and 1848 while Giovanni Spadolini spoke on the same subject for the period 1849-1870.

The Conference Group for Central European History, organized in New York on December 28, 1957, has appointed a standing committee for the study of the problems of the Hapsburg Monarchy. Working in cooperation with similar groups in Austria and elsewhere, this committee is to encourage study in Austrian history in the United States. The members of the committee are: Hans Kohn, chairman, Friedrich Engel-Janosi, Robert A. Kann, Arthur J. May, S. Harrison Thomson, and R. John Rath, secretary. Further announcements concerning the work of the group will be given in due time. Inquiries about this committee should be sent to the secretary, R. John Rath, Department of History, University of Texas, Austin 12, Texas.

A conference on the history of the Italian Church was held in Bologna on September 2-6 under the auspices of the staff of the *Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia* with the twenty-four papers centered around the general subject, "Problemi di Vita Religiosa in Italia nel Cinquecento." At the same time there was a meeting of editors of periodicals dealing with the history of the Catholic Church. Among the authors of papers were representatives of some of the principal Italian universities and several from the congregations of the Roman Curia and the ecclesiastical schools of Rome as well as the following from outside Italy: Hubert Jedin of the University of Bonn, Roger Aubert of the Catholic University of Louvain, Carlo Dionisotti of the University of London, Jean Leclercq, O.S.B., of the Abbey of Clervaux in Luxembourg, and Gilles-Gérard Meersseman, O.P., of the University of Fribourg in Switzerland.

The third annual Francis Parkman Prize for the best work in American history or biography has been announced by the Society of American Historians. Within the colonial period the subject may relate to either the French and Spanish as well as to the English colonies, and religious, literary, or technological subjects are eligible along with political and social history. The entries for the present year will be judged by Willard Thorp of Princeton University, Merle Curti of the University of Wisconsin, and Michael Kraus of the City College of New York. Announcement of the winner of the $500 prize will be made during the winter of 1959. For further details address Rudolf A. Clemen, Society of American Historians, Inc., Princeton University Library, Princeton, New Jersey.

The latest addition to Maryknoll's World Horizon Reports (No. 23) is an attractive and carefully documented analysis of the conference held in 1953 at Chimbote, Peru, under the auspices of the Inter-American Catholic Action Week. The report is entitled *Latin-American Catholicism. A Self-Evaluation* and was written by William J. Coleman, M.M., professor of church history in Maryknoll Seminary, who gives the historical background for the condition of the Church in Latin America today as well as a detailed treatment of the recommendations and remedies suggested by the 300 delegates from twenty republics who attended the Chimbote meeting. Father Coleman was well qualified for the task, having specialized in the history of the Latin American Church during his graduate training and having written his doctoral dissertation on the subject *The First Apostolic Delegation in Rio de Janeiro and Its Influence in Spanish America* (Washington, 1950). After completing his studies he spent six years on the Maryknoll missions in Chile before returning two years ago to his present teaching post at the major seminary. The report can be purchased for $1.00 from Maryknoll Publications, Maryknoll, New York.

Readers of the REVIEW will find the summer number of the *Dublin Review* of more than ordinary interest and relevance. The issue is devoted to eleven brief articles on the present position of the English and Welsh Catholics in relation to scholarship and the intellectual life in general. The problem is analyzed from various points of view with an opening general article by the Bishop of Salford and a discussion of the situation in the sacred sciences by the Abbot of Downside. Michael P. Fogarty of University College, Cardiff, treats the social sciences and A. C. F. Beales of the University of London contributed an article on the training of Catholic teachers. The article of most interest to readers of this journal will naturally be that of David Knowles of the University of Cambridge on "The Need for Catholic Historical Scholarship" (pp. 122-128). He notes that during the last half century much of the earlier bias in historiography has been untwisted by an impressive list of scholars, many of them devout Anglicans, so that today the history of the Church in England is presented "with a technical correctness and an absolute fairness that a Catholic could not wish to be bettered." What is regretted, he adds, is that this new healthy atmosphere finds a dearth of Catholic scholars among the clergy, both secular and regular, due greatly to the growing increase of pastoral demands. The idea for this number of the *Dublin Review* grew out of a meeting of Catholic university professors and lecturers in England and Wales held in the summer of 1957, and was intended as a preliminary survey of the problem for the conference held on September 15-18 of this year at St. Mary's College, Strawberry Hill. American Catholics will find some intriguing points of contrast between the situation described in these articles and that existing in the United States.

Sixty years have passed since the publication of the *Histoire d'une Ame écrite par elle-même* of St. Thérèse of Lisieux. That her sister Pauline (Mother Agnes) had made changes in the text has been generally known, but their extent could not be discovered until the recent appearance of the critical edition of the three manuscripts upon which the autobiography is based. (*Manuscrits autobiographiques de Sainte Thérèse de l'Enfant Jésus.* Carmel de Lisieux, 1956. 4 vols. edited by François de Sainte Marie, O.C.D.) These sources have been carefully edited, some even in facsimile reproduction, with notes, tables of citations, indices of proper names, a chronology, a handwriting analysis by two experts, etc. The comparative study of the published *Histoire d'une Ame* and the manuscripts reveals 7,000 variations; in fact, the list of omissions that are more than a line long fills thirty pages. Father Noel Dermot of the Holy Child, O.C.D., has studied these changes to determine how far they might have obscured the story of the saint or, perhaps, basically altered it. He concludes that the *Histoire* is "a true portrait of St. Thérèse and an accurate statement

of her spiritual doctrine, but it is a work of joint authorship. It is primarily autobiography, and St. Thérèse is the principal author, but it is not only presented but interpreted by Mother Agnes." ("The Published Manuscripts and the *Histoire d'une Ame,* A Critical Problem?" *Ephemerides Carmeliticae* [1958], p. 30.)

Since the recent appearance of the last volumes of Arnold Toynbee's *A Study of History,* the theories of religious syncretism there proposed have been widely discussed. Now an important counterthesis emerges from the first three volumes of *Order and History* by Eric Voegelin (I. *Israel and Revelation;* II, *The World of the Polis;* III, *Plato and Aristotle.* Louisiana State University Press, 1956, 1958, 1958.) Against Toynbeean comparativism and its resultant relativity, he proposes as a remedy for the condition of the West a revitalized interest in the religious and cultural constants that exist in the heritage of Christianity, with special emphasis upon the covenant of the Old Testament. The Voegelin work will be reviewed *in extenso* in a future issue of our journal.

In the latest issue of *Reportorium Novum. Dublin Diocesan Historical Record* (Volume II, No. 1, 1957-1958), Michael J. Curran, the editor, provides another brief but informative article entitled "Dublin Diocesan Archives" on the collections of the Archdiocese of Dublin. The archives were moved during the summer of 1957 from their former location in Archbishop's House, Drumcondra, to the new archives built by the Most Reverend John C. McQuaid, Archbishop of Dublin, at the nearby Holy Cross College, the major seminary of the Archdiocese of Dublin. Monsignor Curran sketches the hazards that beset the efforts to keep their archives of the occupants of the See of Dublin from the early sixteenth century, and he remarks that John Carpenter who ruled the see from 1770 to 1786 was the first archbishop since Tudor times who "felt himself free to keep diocesan records" (p. 3). Concerning the long reign of Daniel Murray (1823-1852), it is stated that "a disappointingly small deposit remains" (p. 4). The collections of the administration of Paul Cardinal Cullen (1852-1878) are much fuller, but the brief administration of Edward Cardinal McCabe (1879-1885) left "a correspondingly small addition to the records" (p. 4). In some future article the editor will, perhaps, find an opportunity to give a general description of the archival holdings for the administrations of William J. Walsh (1885-1921) and Edward J. Byrne (1921-1940). In addition to Monsignor Curran's two contributions in this number of the *Reportorium Novum* there are eleven other articles—listed in the Periodical Literature of this issue of the REVIEW—and it is interesting to note that of the thirteen authors ten are parish priests. There are likewise eighteen items under "Notes and

Queries" and twelve good illustrations. This journal deserves to be widely known among church historians in the United States. The subscription price is £1 or $3.00 and orders should be addressed to Browne and Nolan, Ltd., Nassau Street, Dublin, while articles and correspondence should be sent to the editors at Holy Cross College, Clonliffe, Dublin, Ireland.

At a conference held in Oxford last Easter of students in the field of recusant history the need was expressed for some means of contact between workers in this field. To meet this need Mr. T. A. Birrell has undertaken to act as compiler of a register of students of recusant history as well as editor of an annual newsletter, both of which will appear early in 1959. Mr. Birrell will be grateful, therefore, if those who are working in the field of post-Reformation Catholic history in this country will be good enough to provide him with their names and addresses so that a printed form may be sent to them to be filled in for the register. Interested persons may address Mr. Birrell at 15 The Crescent, Milton, Weston-super-Mare, Somerset, England.

The Franciscan House of Celtic Studies and Historical Research at Dún Mhuire, Killiney, County Dublin, has announced the inauguration of a new journal to be entitled *Collectanea Hibernica*. It will be devoted exclusively to the publication of sources for Irish history and guides to these sources and will contain no articles or book reviews. The rich manuscript materials for Irish history from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries, now housed at Dún Mhuire and originally preserved at Franciscan convents on the continent such as St. Anthony's College, Louvain, and St. Isidore's College, Rome, will be drawn upon, as well as copies of other materials gathered in the Vatican Archives and in other continental archives. The general editor is Benignus Millett, O.F.M., the price of the single number, to appear annually, will be $2,00, and the publishers will be Clonmore & Reynolds, Ltd., 29 Kildare Street, Dublin.

The Department of State has deposited in the National Archives a further collection of 166 containers of microfilms of documents from the archives of the former German Foreign Office. This collection consists mainly of material on the periods 1937-1940 and 1942-1945. Certain microfilms in addition to those previously released from the period 1914-1933 are also included.

Karl M. Schmitt, who for the past two years has been with the Department of State as a specialist in Latin American affairs, has resigned his position to accept an appointment as assistant professor of government in the University of Texas. Dr. Schmitt took his A.B. and A.M. degrees

at the Catholic University of America and his Ph.D. in 1954 at the University of Pennsylvania where his dissertation was a study of the evolution of Church-State relations in Mexico under Porfirio Diaz.

Robert I. Burns, S.J., has joined the Department of History of the University of San Francisco. Father Burns has been a frequent contributor in past years to journals such as *Speculum, Mid-America, Pacific Historical Review, Historical Bulletin,* and the *Pacific Northwest Quarterly,* and recently has been abroad collecting materials relating to mediaeval Catalan history.

The Görres-Gesellschaft held a four-day meeting in Salzburg from September 27 to October 1. In the historical section there were six papers among which was one on "The Austrian Veto in the Conclave of 1903" by Friedrich Engel-Janosi of the Catholic University of America.

Laurence J. FitzSimon, Bishop of Amarillo, died on July 2 at the age of sixty-three. He was consecrated on October 22, 1941, as second ordinary of the See of Amarillo and during his nearly seventeen years there his interest in the Catholic history of the Southwest prompted him to assemble a significant collection of source materials on the religious and secular history of the region. Although Bishop FitzSimon was not a professionally trained historian, he had a fine sense of the value of historical sources and he was of great assistance to a number of students who were working on projects in the history of the Southwest. For many years he had been custodian of the collections originally gathered under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus of Texas, and to these he had added numerous photostats of documents which he had collected from the archives of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide in Rome and from the archives of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith of Lyons and Paris. A calendar of these materials was in the course of preparation at the time of Bishop FitzSimon's death.

In our July issue mention was made (p. 244) of the appointment of Richard Walsh of Georgetown University to "the editorial staff" of the *Maryland Historical Magazine.* It should have read "editor of the *Maryland Historical Magazine.*" We are sorry for this error.

BRIEF NOTICES

BOWRA, C. M. *The Greek Experience.* (Cleveland and New York: World Publishing Co. 1958. Pp. xiv, 211. $6.00.)

This volume inaugurates a new series entitled World Histories of Civilization, under the general editorship of the distinguished ancient historian Ronald Syme of the University of Oxford. The series is to comprise about twenty volumes, and the author of each is given complete freedom in the treatment of the subject assigned as his theme. The books are intended for the general reader rather than for the specialist, but are to be authoritative and up-to-date. Each is to contain about 300-400 pages and will be furnished with copious illustrations.

Sir Maurice Bowra, as his previous publications would lead us to expect, has written a masterly and brilliant sketch of Greek civilization in its characteristic political, social, religious, artistic, and intellectual aspects to the fall of Athens in 404 B.C. Special attention is called to his profound analysis of Greek religion and its influence, of the role of the city and the individual in Greek life and thought, of the concept of the good man and the good life, and of Greek conceptions and achievements in art. The notes furnished for each chapter are confined to references to the ancient authors. There are sixty-four pages of well executed illustrations and a brief index.

The excellence of what Professor Bowra has given us makes us only regret the more that he did not extend his work to the normal length projected for the series. His treatment could then have been somewhat fuller and might have included the fourth century before Alexander. *The Greek Experience* is recommended as a masterly, well-balanced, and beautifully written appreciation of Greek civilization. It is an ideal gift book. (MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE)

CASTILLO, BERNAL DIAZ DEL. *The Discovery and Conquest of Mexico.* Translated and edited by A. P. Maudslay. Introduction to the American edition by Irving A. Leonard. (New York: Grove Press, Inc. 1958. Pp. xxxi, 478. $2.45.)

This edition of Bernal Díaz's celebrated classic of the conquest of Mexico is a reprint of A. P. Maudslay's excellent translation, which was first published by the Hakluyt Society in 1908 in five volumes. A reprint yes, but with some changes which improve the dramatic clarity of the

story. Material not relating directly to the discovery and conquest of Mexico has been omitted. The present volume ends with the fall of Tenochtitlán. The latter part of Bernal Díaz's account dealing with the march to Honduras—an anti-climactic sequel to the conquest of the Aztecs—is not included. Some selections from the letters of Cortés have been inserted in the interest of making clearer the topography of the siege of the capital. And certainly not the least significant innovation of this American edition is the suggestive introductory essay of Irving Leonard.

The thesis of López de Gómara which provoked Bernal to write—that the conquest of Mexico was the biography of Hernán Cortés—was not merely the consequence of Gómara's aristocratic, individualist, and heroic conception of history. Gómara also had a sound grasp of the decisive role of leadership in a military campaign, a more realistic understanding of this factor than Bernal did. For this and other penetrating insights into that endless dialogue between the partisans of Gómara and Bernal, we are indebted to the late Ramón Iglesia *(El hombre Colón y otros ensayos)*. That Bernal's vision was at times parochial can never obscure the fact that he left us an earthy, dramatic, and often eloquent account of the conquest as seen through the eyes of one of its heroic participants. This fact alone justifies the reprinting of this classic. (JOHN LEDDY PHELAN)

DAVIS, CHARLES TILL. *Dante and the Idea of Rome*. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1957. Pp. 302. $4.80.)

This scholarly and interesting volume contains the results of a painstaking study of one of Dante's leading ideas. All readers of the *Divine Comedy* will be aware of the high importance and at the same time of the great complexity of his thoughts about Rome. Here the thoughts are analyzed very clearly and traced to the numerous sources from which Dante built his synthesis. Rome, the seat of government of the pagan empire; Rome, the Utopian capital of the ideal Christian empire; Rome, the throne of Christ's vicar—all these were one Rome in the magnificent dream of the poet. He preserves, says Mr. Davis, the "secular integrity of ancient Rome, leaving it its own merits, its own function, its own reason for being; but at the same time places it within the wider context of God's plan and Christ's revelation, recognizing that it has been transformed into the Christian city which is above all a symbol of man's salvation, 'quella Roma onde Cristo è romano.' "

Mr. Davis treats of this synthesis in the two concluding chapters in a masterly fashion. But he previously gives separate studies of Virgil, of Augustine and Orosius, and of several of the less celebrated mediaeval

writers including Brunetto Latini. Most interesting, perhaps, is the section on Augustine and Orosius, where he brings out the shift in opinion on the ancient empire between master and pupil and the corresponding shift in opinion between the younger and the more mature Dante. "For Augustine, Rome was like any other kingdom; for Orosius, Roman history was unique, and guided by a special providence." So Dante came to think. This is a very imperfect summary of the rich and learned treatment given to the subject in this chapter of Mr. Davis' treatise.

The minute studies of the ideas of great writers is often overdone because of the fact that the writer in question does not have the substance to reward such inquiry. Dante is great enough to make such a search rewarding. This is one of the latest in the great library of Dante studies built up through the centuries and we believe it is one of the distinguished contributions to such studies. (JOHN K. CARTWRIGHT)

Documents on German Foreign Policy, 1918-1945. Series C. *The Third Reich: First Phase.* Volume I. *January-October, 1933.* (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1957. Pp. lxiv, 962. $3.75.)

This rather large volume begins with Hitler's assumption of power (January 30, 1933), and ends on October 14, 1933, with Germany's withdrawal from the League of Nations and the Disarmament Conference. The 502 documents which have been carefully selected and edited with admirable thoroughness are presented in chronological order. The analytical list at the beginning of the volume enables the reader to trace topics. The editors have been generous with footnotes for cross-references, references to documents lost or omitted, correction of errors, and other vital information. The translations (for which the editors have accepted final responsibility) are highly accurate.

The fateful period covered in this volume was marked by vague hopes and disillusionment, mutual distrust and growing international tensions, demonstrations of good will and threats and terror. Yet while the disturbing symptoms of Germany's new aggressiveness kept public opinion and cabinets alarmed, nothing really spectacular happened except for Germany's withdrawal from the Disarmament Conference and the League of Nations. To be sure, unilateral actions in open violation of existing agreements and frequent incidents caused frictions, and intensified already existing antagonisms. But all complaints, diplomatic *démarches,* or protests were handled according to the established routine. In each case the incident was soon closed or seemed forgotten. None of the great powers, not even the U.S.S.R., wanted to make things difficult for Germany.

Of special interest are the twenty-four documents dealing with the concordat between the Holy See and the Reich. It is clearly evident that the conclusion of the Reich concordat meant a lot to Hitler. A month after its ratification Pope Pius XI instructed Cardinal Pacelli to lodge a strong protest against the violations of the concordat and the increasing oppression of Catholics in Germany (No. 501). The fate of little Austria constitutes the gloomiest chapter of the book. Hitler was determined to bring Austria within the orbit of his power. Notwithstanding Mussolini's repeated, although not particularly energetic, efforts in behalf of the Dollfuss regime, the situation grew worse during the summer months. One is surprised to find Dr. Joseph Wirth in the role of a self-appointed counsellor (No. 130), ready to supply the Wilhelmstrasse with advice on the Austrian problem, and to assist in a suggested attempt to mediate between Dollfuss and the Reich (No. 270). Even more surprising is that Wirth obtained a bit of confidential information from Czech circles close to Masaryk, and eagerly passed it on to Ambassador von Hassell in Rome. In 1933 the Third Reich could count on many unrecognized friends, supporters, and well-wishers. (HANS W. L. FREUDENTHAL)

GOHMAN, SISTER MARY DE LOURDES, O.S.U. *Chosen Arrows; An Historical Narrative.* (New York: Pageant Press, Inc. Pp. ix, 533. $5.00.)

This book commemorates the founding of the Ursuline community in Louisville. The author has stated in her introduction that her purpose was "to develop an historical account with the least appearance of history, and yet to keep data and people true to facts." This Sister Mary de Lourdes has succeeded in doing. She traces her community from Straubing in Bavaria through the planting, growth, and development of this Louisville branch of the great Ursuline Order. It is a story of perseverance and faith in the midst of poverty and privation of every kind; perseverance that eventually laid the foundations for the progress and accomplishments of the present institution.

The author uses the reminiscing style to tell the story of her community. The trials, crosses, blessings, and triumphs give an insight into the daily life of a religious congregation. By linking the history of the times with the daily life of the community, a proper perspective is gained. At times the author so minutely describes the structure of former buildings, that those who have been educated within their walls may thereby relive the old days. The postulants, novices, and the younger members of the community will find herein a true knowledge of their ancestry. For all those who have been educated in the Ursuline tradition and for their many friends, especially those among the clergy and the laity who have watched

the growth of the order, it will have a special appeal. Written in popular style, the format is good, although it would have been helpful to the reader if an index had been added. (SISTER LAURITA GIBSON)

GRANT, MICHAEL. *Roman History from Coins. Some Uses of the Imperial Coinage to the Historian.* (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1958. Pp. 95. $2.75.)

The main part of this little book consists of the J. H. Gray Lectures delivered at Cambridge in 1955 by the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Khartoum. It would be difficult to overrate the importance of the work in making the imperial coins useful as sources of information to students and historians. We have long needed such a treatment. It is especially useful as a work which students of history may read for the purpose of learning the nature of numismatic evidence and, incidentally, some Roman history as well. The chapters indicate the nature of the treatment: How rulers thought of their coins; Coins and personalities; The empire on its coinage; New evidence for the past; Approach to world coinage. There is a map of the empire and, best of all, a series of thirty-two excellent plates each containing clear photographs of eight to ten Roman coins. There is also a note on ancient and modern books, a key to the plates which identifies the metals used, and an adequate index.

There are some new and interesting things here, too, for all of us. One very important idea, adequately illustrated, is the use the emperors made of coins for purposes of publicity and propaganda. The new and unique evidence obtained from coins is also set forth, e.g., the new emperor or imperial claimant, Uranius, is known from no other records, and the same is true of some imperial women, such as Dryantilla and Cornelia Supera. The city coinages also reveal new persons to us and the buildings, events, and incidents known only from coins add significantly to our scanty knowledge of some periods of imperial history. The chapter on the mints and their coinages is one of the best and will certainly help to make more intelligible to the historian a highly technical subject which is difficult to master. (THOMAS A. BRADY)

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

GENERAL

Chrétienté et histoire. François Lepargneur, O.P. (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa,* July-Sept., 1958).

O Professor Católico em face do ensino da História (11). Mário C. Giordani (*Vozes Revista Católica de Cultura,* May, 1958).

L'enciclica *Pascendi* e gli studi biblici. A. Bea (*Biblica,* Fasc. 2, 1958).

A Historian's Calling. Donald Nicholl (*Downside Review,* Summer, 1958).

The Anamneses and Institution Narrative in the Liturgy of *Apostolic Constitutions.* Book VIII. W. E. Pitt (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* Apr., 1958).

Esquisse d'une histoire du Sacrement de Pénitence. H. Rondet, S.J. (*Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* June, 1958).

The Place of Anarchism in the History of Political Thought. D. Novak (*Review of Politics,* July, 1958).

The Role of the Learned Man in Government. Paul H. Nitze (*Review of Politics,* July, 1958).

The Meaning of Architecture. John Ely Burchard (*Review of Politics,* July, 1958).

History Among the Paperbacks. O. Lawrence Burnette, Jr. (*Wisconsin Magazine of History,* Summer, 1958).

ANTIQUITY

Thèmes majeurs de la Tradition sacerdotale dans le Pentateuque. J. Roth, C.SS.R. (*Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* July-Aug., 1958).

New Light on Cyprian. John L. Rossner (*Anglican Theological Review,* July, 1958).

La querelle autour du *Tolle, lege.* H. I. Marrou (*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique,* No. 1, 1958).

Der Apostel Thomas in Südindien (II). P. J. Lamers, O. Praem. (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft Nouvelle Revue de science missionnaire,* Fasc. 2, 1958).

The Early Church and the Ecumenical Problem. Oscar Cullmann (*Anglican Theological Review,* July, 1958).

MEDIAEVAL AND EARLY RENAISSANCE

Historical Background of Christendom in the Middle East. J. J. W. Murphy (*Studies,* Summer, 1958).

A Tractate About the Council of Florence Attributed to George Amiroutzes. Joseph Gill, S.J. (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* Apr., 1958).

El abaciologio de San Cugat del Vallés en el siglo XI. Antonio Ubieto Arteta (*Hispania Sacra,* Jan.-June, 1957).

The Anglo-Norman Conquest of Ireland and St. Patrick. Dublin and Armagh in Jocelin's Life of St. Patrick. Joseph Szöverffy (*Reportorium Novum,* Vol. II, No. 1, 1957-8).

L'idée de la seigneurerie du Christ au moyen âge. J. Leclercq (*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique,* No. 1, 1958).

Northamptonshire Records. Joan Wake (*Speculum,* Apr., 1958).

The Liturgy in Dublin, 1200-1500: Manuscript Sources. William Hawkes (*Reportorium Novum,* Vol. II, No. 1, 1957-8).

The Holy Wells of County Dublin. Caoimhin Ó Danachair (*Reportorium Novum,* Vol. II, No. 1, 1957-8).

Secular Dramatics in the Royal Palace, Paris, 1378, 1389, and Chaucer's "Tregetoures." Laura Hibbard Loomis (*Speculum,* Apr., 1958).

Florence and Henry of Luxemburg, King of the Romans: The Rebirth of Guelfism. William Bowsky (*Speculum,* Apr., 1958).

"The Emperor John VIII Slept Here." Kenneth M. Setton (*Speculum, Apr.,* 1958).

Corrodies at the Carmelite Friary of Lynn, By the Late A. G. Little. Eric Stone, Ed. (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* Apr., 1958).

Mediaeval Art and Aesthetics in *The Canterbury Tales.* Przemyslaw Mroczkowski (*Speculum,* Apr., 1958).

Letter-Splitting in Petrarch's *Familiares.* Aldo S. Bernardo (*Speculum,* Apr., 1958).

La mitigazione del 1432 della regola carmelitana: tempo e persone. Ludovico Saggi, O.Carm. (*Carmelus,* Fasc. 1, 1958).

Fra Filippo Lippi pittore carmelitano. Paolo Caioli, O.Carm. (*Carmelus,* Fasc. 1, 1958).

Les bulles pontificales et l'expansion portugaise au XV[e] s. (suite). Ch.-M. De Witte (*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique,* No. 1, 1958).

Nuncios, colectores y legados pontificos en España de 1474 a 1492. Justo Fernández Alonso (*Hispania Sacra,* Jan.-June, 1957).

La embajada de Castilla en el Concilio de Basilea y su discusión con los ingleses acerca de la precedencia. R. P. Vicente Beltrán de Heredia, O.P. (*Hispania Sacra,* Jan.-June, 1957).

Le siècle de la réforme face au problème de la tolérance. R. Mols, S.J. (*Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* June, 1958).

LATE RENAISSANCE AND MODERN

El Problema de los orígenes y evolución del pensamiento teológico de Miguel Bayo. Miguel Roco (*Anthologica Annua,* 1957).

Reacción del Cabildo de Burgos ante las visitas y otros actos de jurisdición intentados por sus obispos (silgos XIV-XVII). Demetrio Mansilla (*Hispania Sacra,* Jan.-June, 1957).

España, el Papado y el Imperio durante la Guerra de los Triente Años. Quintín Aldea, S.I. (*Miscelanea Comillas,* XXIX, 1958).

Una memoria biográfica sobre Juan Andrés por Francisco Javier Borrull y Vilanova, 1822. Miguel Batllori, S.I. (*Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu,* Jan.-June, 1958).

Iglesia y Estado en el epílogo de la dominacion española en Flandes. Pedro Voltes (*Hispania Sacra,* Jan.-June, 1957).

Spanish Nationalism in the Struggle Against Napoleon. Edward J. Goodman (*Review of Politics,* July, 1958).

Aspetti della Politica Ecclesiastica Austriaca nell 'Opera Dei Censori Veneti (1798-1805). Letterio Briguglio (*Rassegna Storica Del Risorgimento,* Oct.-Dec., 1957).

Conflicto entre el Catdenal Primado y el Nuncio Monseñor Gravina en 1809-1814. Isidoro de Villapadierna, O.F.M. Cap. (*Anthologica Annua,* 1957).

Las Cuentas de las galeras enviadas por Juan I de Castilla en favor de Clemente VII de Aviñon. José Zunzunegui (*Anthologica Annua,* 1957).

Richerche storiche sul *Giacobinismo* italiano. Renzo de Felice (*Rassegna Storica Del Risorgimento,* Jan.-Mar., 1958).

The Historical Background of the English Lectionary of 1955. Geoffrey G. Willis (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* Apr., 1958).

Spanish and English Religious Poetry of the Seventeenth Century. Edward M. Wilson (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* Apr., 1958).

Sir Kenelm Digby and Siena. Dennis E. Rhodes (*British Museum Quarterly,* No. 3, 1958).

Titus Oates, le Père de La Chaize et le grand Arnauld, 1678-1681. G. Guitton (*Review d'Histoire Ecclésiastique,* No. 1, 1958).

Lord Acton and the Religion of Charles II. Walter G. Simon (*Anglican Theological Review,* July, 1958).

The Charity Sermons, 1704-1932, as a Source for the History of Education. W. E. Tate (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* Apr., 1958).

A List of 17th Century Dublin Diocesan Priests. William M. O'Riordan (*Reportorium Novum,* Vol. II, No. 1, 1957-8).

Glimpses of 18th Century Dublin Priests. John Meagher (*Reportorium Novum,* Vol. II, No. 1, 1957-8).

Dublin Diocesan Archives. Michael J. Curran (*Reportorium Novum,* Vol. II, No. 1, 1957-8).

Instructions, Admonitions, etc., of Archbishop Carpenter, 1770-1786. (*Reportorium Novum,* Vol. II, No. 1, 1957-8).

The Early Cullen Family. An t-Athair Peadar Mac Suibhne (*Reportorium Novum,* Vol. II, No. 1, 1957-8).

Other Cullen Tombstones. An t-Athair Peadar Mac Suibhne (*Reportorium Novum,* Vol. II, No. 1, 1957-8).

Catholic Families of the Pale (continued). John Kingston (*Reportorium Novum,* Vol. II, No. 1, 1957-8).

Parish of Ballymore Eustace, 1791. William Hawkes (*Reportorium Novum,* Vol. II, No. 1, 1957-8).

Commentary, Luther and Tetzel's Preaching of Indulgences, 1516-1518. John M. Lenhart, O.F.M. Cap. (*Franciscan Studies,* Mar., 1958).

Une vie illustrée de Notre-Seigneur au temps des Ming. J. Dehergne, S.J. (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft Nouvelle Revue de science missionnaire,* Fasc. 2, 1958).

Les réductions catholiques du pays des Alashans (II). Jos. Van Hecken, C.I.C.M. (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft Nouvelle Revue de science missionnaire,* Fasc. 2, 1958).

Ladislaus Köszeghy, Ex-jesuit, Bischof von Csanád (1745-1828). Kálman Juhász. (*Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu,* Jan.-June, 1958).

John Frederick Haeger, S.P.G. Missionary to the Palatines. Glenn Weaver (*Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church,* June, 1958).

CONTEMPORARY

The Group Basis of Austrian Politics. Alfred Diamant (*Journal of Central European Affairs,* July, 1958).

Der Wandel der Missionslage seit dem zweiten Weltkrieg. Joh Beckmann, S.M.B. (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft Nouvelle Revue de science missionnaire,* Fasc. 2, 1958).

The Rumanian Constitution of 1952: A Critical Analysis. Randolph L. Braham (*Journal of Central European Affairs,* July, 1958).

AMERICAN

A Quarter Century of American Historiography. Wendell H. Stephenson (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review,* June, 1958).

America in Some Travelers, Historians, and Political Economists of the Spanish Eighteenth Century. Anthony Tudisco (*Americas,* July, 1958).

Epitaphs from the Cemetery of the First Roman Catholic Church in Georgia. Contributed by A. Mell Lunceford, Jr. (*Georgia Historical Quarterly,* June, 1958).

The Creole-American Struggle in New Orleans Politics, 1850-1862. Leon C. Soulé (*Louisiana Historical Quarterly,* Jan., 1957).

Roger B. Taney's "Bank War Manuscript." Carl Brent Swisher, Ed. (*Maryland Historical Magazine,* June, 1958).

Roger Brooke Taney's Account of His Relation with Thomas Ellicott in the Bank War (*Concluded from March*). Stuart Bruchey, Ed. (*Maryland Historical Magazine,* June, 1958).

"American Religious Philosophy and the Pastoral Letters of the House of Bishops." George Reuben Metcalf (*Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church,* Mar., 1958).

Indian Missions of the Episcopal Church in Oklahoma. Sam L. Botkin (*Chronicles of Oklahoma,* Spring, 1958).

"My Little Book of Praise": A Miscellany of Meditations and Views on Church Unity from the Unpublished Papers of Bishop Charles Henry Brent (1862-1929). Frederick Ward Kates, Ed. (*Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church,* June, 1958).

L'Eglise catholique au Canada. Théophile Bertrand (*Culture,* June, 1958).

Deux Mémoires de Champlain (1618). André Vachon (*La Revue de L'Université Laval,* June, 1958).

Les français et les afrancesados en Amérique Centrale, 1700-1810. Jacques Houdaille (*Revista de Historia de América,* Dec., 1957).

La construction du premier chemin Québec-Montréal et le problème des corvées (1706-1737). Roland Sanfaçon (*Revue d'Histoire de l'Amerique Francaise,* June, 1958).

Abbé P. J. L. Desjardins and the Scheme for the Settlement of French Priests in Canada, 1792-1802. M. G. Hutt (*Canadian Historical Review,* June, 1958).

L'implantation de l'Eglise canadienne en Colombie-Britannique (1838-1848) (suite). Émilien Lamibrande, O.M.I. (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa,* July-Sept., 1958).

Monseigneur Antoine Racine et la question universitaire canadienne (1875-1892). Germain Lavallée (*Revue d'Histoire de l'Amérique Francaise,* June, 1958).

Carlos Eduardo Castañedo, 1896-1958. J. Lloyd Mechan (*Hispanic American Historical Review,* Aug., 1958).

Le Père Paul Le Jeune, S.J., missionnaire-colonisateur. Jules Chaussé, S.J. (*Revue d'Histoire de l'Amérique Française,* June, 1958).

Catholics of the Ukrainian Rite in Canada. A. Luhovy (*Eastern Churches Quarterly,* Spring, 1958).

Carlos Eduardo Castañeda. Mathias C. Kiemen (*Americas,* July, 1958).

Barros Arana Historiador de la Independencia de Chile. Alamiro de Avila Martel (*Boletin de la Academia Nacional de la Historia,* Vol. XXVIII, 1957).

Dom Feliciano, 1º Bispo do Rio Grande do Sul (1858-1958). Arlindo Rubert (*Revista Ecclesiástica Brasileira,* June, 1958).

Jose Luis Bustamante, un Historiador Olvidado. Ricardo Zorraquin Becú (*Boletin de la Academia Nacional de la Historia,* Vol. XXVIII, 1957).

Eugenio Espejo: a man of the Enlightenment in Ecuador, 369. Philip L. Astuto (*Revista de Historia de América,* Dec., 1957).

Autenticidad de las Noticias Secretas de América. Ricardo Donoso (*Revista de Historia de América,* Dec., 1957).

Las renuncias de bienes en la provincia del Paraguay, Siglo XVIII. Pedro Grenón, S.I. (*Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu,* Jan.-June, 1958).

Buenos Aires as Seen by British Travelers, 1810-1860. S. Samuel Trifilo (*Americas,* July, 1958).

Disertaciones en el Centenario de la Muerte del Almirante Brown. Eleazar Videla, Ricardo Levene, Benjamin Villegas Basavilbaso (*Boletin de la Academia Nacional de la Historia,* Vol. XXVIII, 1957).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Adams, Randolph G. *Political Ideas of the American Revolution. Britannic-American Contributions to the Problem of Imperial Organization 1765 to 1775.* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc. 1958. Pp. vii, 216. $3.75.) This third edition includes a commentary by Merrill Jensen of the University of Wisconsin.

Alegre, Francisco Javier, S.J. *Historia de la Provincia de la Compañia de Jesus de Nueva España.* Tomo II. Vol. XIII. Libros 4-6 (anas 1579-1639) Nueva edicion por Ernest J. Burrus, S.J. y Felix Zubeleaga, S.J. (Roma: Institutum Historicum, S.J. 1958. Pp. xxxii, 747.)

Anthologica Annua No. 5. Publicaciones del Instituto Español de Estudios Eclesiasticos. (Rome: Iglesia Nacional Española. 1957, Pp. 682.)

Bannon, John Francis, S.J. and Peter Masten Dunne. *Latin America. An Historical Survey.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1958. Pp. x, 625. $7.50.) A revised edition that brings the story down to August, 1957.

Buchberger, Michael. *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche.* Erster Band: *A Bis Baronius.* (New York: Herder and Herder, Inc. 1958. Pp. 48, 1271. $21.60.)

Bury, J. B. *History of the Later Roman Empire from the death of Theodosius I. to the death of Justinian.* Vols. I and II. (New York: Dover Publications, Inc. 1958. Pp. xxv, 471; ix, 494. $2.00 each.) An unabridged paperback reprint, on good paper and with seven signatures, of Bury's great work, first published by Macmillan in 1923. This is now made easily available again, and at an unusually low price.

Cable, George W., Edited by Arlin Turner. *The Negro Question. A Selection of Writings on Civil Rights in the South.* (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc. 1958. Pp. xix, 286. $3.95.) An analysis written over sixty years ago. Cable was evidently not very much taken with Catholicism. Speaking of a certain man who was part Negro he mentions that he was "nominally and by superstition a Roman Catholic" (p. 38).

Catta, Etienne and Tony Catta. Translated by Edward L. Heston, C.S.C. *Basil Anthony Mary Moreau.* Vol. I. *The Foundation of Holy Cross.* Vol. II. *The Canonical Erection of Holy Cross.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1955. Pp. xxix, 1016; vi, 1108.)

Chadwick, Nora K. et al. *Studies in the Early British Church.* (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1958. Pp. vii, 356.)

Chorley, Kenneth. *The New Commonwealth of the Intellect.* (London: The English-Speaking Union of the Commonwealth. 1958. Pp. 39.) An address under the auspices of the English-Speaking Union of the Commonwealth, at the Royal Institution of Great Britain, on February 27, 1958; with some brief remarks on the return of the Carleton Papers.

Costello, William T., S.J. *The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1958. Pp. 221. $4.50.)

Crofts, Alfred and Percy Buchanan. *A History of the Far East.* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1958. Pp. 626. $6.50.)

Croghan, George. Edited by Francis Paul Prucha. *Army Life on the Western Frontier. Selections from the Official Reports Made Between 1826 and 1845.* (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press. 1958. Pp. xxxvi, 187. $4.00.)

Dark, Philip. *Mixtec Ethnohistory. A Method of Analysis of the Codical Art.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1958. Pp. 61. $4.80.)

de Bertier de Sauvigny, G. *France and the European Alliance 1816-1821. The Private correspondence between Metternich and Richelieu.* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 1958. Pp. xiii, 130.)

Department of State. U.S. *Participation in the UN. Report by the President to the Congress for the Year 1957.* (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1957. Pp. xvi, 304. 75¢ paper.) Publication 6654. International Organization and Conference Series III, 128.

Dunn, William Kailer. *What Happened to Religious Education? The Decline of Religious Teaching in the Public Elementary School. 1776-1861.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1958. Pp. xv, 346. $5.00.)

Freedom, Prerequisite to Lasting Peace. (New York: Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe. 1957. Pp. 167.) A slender volume that summarizes the program and activities of the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe for the years 1951-1956 in problems relating to central and eastern Europe.

Garvin, Joseph N., C.S.C. and James A. Corbett. *The Summa Contra Haereticos Ascribed to Praepositinus of Cremona.* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 1958. Pp. lviii, 302. $7.50.)

Geyl, Pieter. *The Revolt of the Netherlands (1555-1609).* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc. 1958. Pp. 310. $6.00.) The third printing of a work that appeared originally in English twenty-five years ago and has been regarded by many reviewers as the best introduction to the history of the Dutch revolt against Spain. The author is professor of modern history in the University of Utrecht.

Guerreiro, António Coelho. *O "Livro de Rezão."* (Lisboa: Companhia de Diamantes de Angola. 1956. Pp. 94, 47.)

Haring, C. H. *Empire in Brazil. A New World Experiment with Monarchy.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1958. Pp. 182. $4.00.)

Johansen, Dorothy O. and Charles M. Gates. *Empire of the Columbia. A History of the Pacific Northwest.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1957. Pp. xv, 685. $6.00.)

Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, 1756. Vol. XXXII, Part 2. (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society. 1958. Pp. xii, 522. $7.50.)

Kennedy, John J. *Catholicism, Nationalism, and Democracy in Argentina.* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 1958. Pp. xii, 219. $4.75.)

Kraemer, Casper J., Jr., Ed. *Excavations at Nessana.* Vol. III. *Non-Literary Papyri.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1958. Pp. xxiii, 355. $7.50.)

Lepp, Ignace. *From Karl Marx to Jesus Christ.* (New York: Sheed & Ward. 1958. Pp. 212. $3.75.) The spiritual autobiography of a convert from Communism. Father Lepp is at present editor of the *Catholic Journal* and director of the Institut de Psychsynthèse in Paris.

Marcus, John T. *French Socialism in the Crisis Years, 1933-1936. Fascism and the French Left.* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc. 1958. Pp. xv, 216. $5.00.)

Mango, Cyril. *The Homilies of Photius Patriarch of Constantinople.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1958. Pp. xii, 327. $6.00.)

Mansilla, Demetrio, et al. *Anthologica Annua. Publicaciones del Instituto Español de Estudios Eclesiasticos.* Vol. V. (Roma: Iglesia Nacional Española. 1957. Pp. 682.) In Volume V (1957) of *Anthologica Annua* the study on "La reorganización eclesiástica espanola del siglo XVI" by Demetrio Mansilla is continued. In the preceding volume he dealt with the dioceses in Aragon and Catalonia and in the present one with those in Castille and Navarre. The careful, documented work will be very useful for research in Spanish church history. Vicente

Rodriguez Valencia makes a valuable contribution to the little-known history of the secular clergy in sixteenth-century South America: "El clero secular de Suramerico en tiempo de Santo Toribio de Mogrovejo." Other articles of this solid annual of the Instituto Español de Estudios Eclesiásticos of Rome (Via Giulia, 151) are listed in our Periodical Literature.

Mason, Alpheus Thomas. *The Supreme Court from Taft to Warren.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1958. Pp. xv, 250. $4.95.)

Masterson, James R., Ed. *Writings on American History 1952. Volume II of the Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the year 1954.* (Washington: National Historical Publications Commission, U. S. Government Printing Office. 1958. Pp. xiii, 573.)

McDonald, Forrest. *We the People. The Economic Origins of the Constitution.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1958. Pp. x, 436. $7.00.)

Meiburger, Sister Anne Vincent. *Efforts of Raymond Robins toward the Recognition of Soviet Russia and the Outlawry of War, 1917-1933.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1958. Pp. ix, 225. $2.50.)

Miller, William D. *Memphis During the Progressive Era 1900-1917.* (Madison: American History Research Center. 1957. Pp. ix, 242. $4.50.) A documented monograph by a professor of American history in Marquette University who is working on a biography of Memphis' famous citizen, Edward H. Crump.

Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs Herausgegeben von der Generaldirektion. 10 Band. (Wien: Druck und Verlag Ferdinand Berger, Horn, N.-O. 1957. Pp. viii, 554.)

Okun, Bernard. *Trends in Birth Rates in the United States since 1870.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1958. Pp. 203.)

Neill, Thomas P. *Readings in the History of Western Civilization.* Vol. II. *College Readings Series No. 4.* (Westminster: Newman Press. 1958. Pp. xii, 409. $2.25.)

Partner, Peter. *The Papal State Under Martin V. The administration and government of the temporal power in the early fifteenth century.* (London: British School at Rome. 1958. Pp. ix, 264. 25s.)

Power, Edward J. *A History of Catholic Higher Education in the United States.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1958. Pp. xiii, 383. $7.00.)

Prescott, H.F.M. *Once to Sinai.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1958. Pp. 310. $5.00.)

Read, Donald. *Peterloo. The "Massacre" and its Background.* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc. 1958. Pp. ix, 234. $6.00.) A closely documented monograph on the famous episode outside Manchester in August, 1819, which played so prominent a part in later English history, done by an assistant lecturer in history in the Univresity of Leeds.

Rhoads, James Berton and Charlotte M. Ashby, Compilers. *Preliminary Inventory of the Cartographic Records of the Bureau of the Census (Record Group 29).* (Washington: National Archives and Records Service. 1958. Pp. v, 108.)

Robertson, D. W., Jr. (Trans. and Ed.). *Saint Augustine on Christian Doctrine.* (New York: Liberal Arts Press. 1958. Pp. xxii, 169. 95¢.) This volume translated with an introduction by an associate professor of English at Princeton is No. 80 in the Library of Liberal Arts.

Rochais, D. Henricvs, O.S.B. (Ed.). *Corpvs Christianorvm.* Series Latina CXVII *Defensoris. Locogiacensis Monachi. Liber Scintillarvm.* (Turnholti, Belgium: Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii. 1957. Pp. xxxi, 689.)

Schmaus, Michael. *Katholische Dogmatik.* Dritter Band: erster Halbband: *Die Lehre von der Kirche.* 5th ed. (München: Max Hueber Verlag. 1958. Pp. xvi, 934. 37.50 D.M.) With the publication of this part of the monumental *Katholische Dogmatik* of Monsignor Schmaus all its eight sections have reached the fifth edition. This part, the treatise on ecclesiology, has undergone more than the usual revision because of *Mystica Corporis,* the ecumenical problem, and the great amount of literature that has appeared since 1940. Hence there is lengthy and new treatment of the Church as the Body of Christ, the Holy Spirit and the Church, etc. Thick as the volume is, the historian will be disappointed in the brevity of the treatment on Church and State. The role of the laity in the Church receives new presentation. The author has felt that he has an obligation to explain the Church to non-Catholic scholars.

Schrier, Arnold. *Ireland and the American Emigration 1850-1900.* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1958. Pp. x, 210. $4.50.)

Schuyler, Robert Livingston and Edward T. James (Eds.). *Dictionary of American Biography. Supplement Two* [to December 31, 1940]. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1958. Pp. viii, 745. $15.00.)

Snyder, Louis L. *Documents of German History.* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1958. Pp. xxiii, 619. $10.00.)

Stavrianos, L. S. *The Balkans Since 1453.* (New York: Rinehart & Co., Inc. 1958. Pp. xxi, 970. $12.00.)